DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 537 HE 001 619

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Women in the University of Chicago. Report of the Committee on University Women. |
| INSTITUTION | Chicago Univ., Ill. |
| PUB DATE | 1 May 70 |
| NOTE | 125p. |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.35 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Academic Achievement, College Students, Degrees (Titles), Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), Educational Opportunities, *Employment Patterns, Enrollment, Equal Opportunities (Jobs), *Females, *Higher Education, *Women Professors, *Womens Education |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Chicago University |

ABSTRACT

Part 1 of this report on the status of women at the University of Chicago deals with women on the regular teaching faculties, their numbers and locations, potential pools of faculty women, recruitment procedures, promotions and reappointments, cases of alleged discrimination, nepotism, work patterns, reported satisfactions and dissatisfactions, equity in faculty salaries, salaries of married women, women as teachers and researchers, part-time appointment, period to tenure, changing career patterns, the tandem team, and child care. It also discusses women lecturers and research associates, their number and types, satisfactions and dissatisfaction, and why so many women are in these positions. Part 2 deals with women students, specifically: (1) trends in enrollment and degrees granted; (2) admissions and financial aid policies as they affect women; (3) attrition rates; (4) career plans; (5) older students; (6) part-time students and the problem of child care; and (7) campus student life. Part 3 summarizes the findings and recommendations. The appendices present data on: (1) awards, honors, and administrative positions; (2) earned PhDs from leading universities by sex; (3) changes in the supply of highly educated women; (4) the student survey; and (5) dissents and comments. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED041537

# WOMEN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY WOMEN

MAY 1, 1970

(PREPARED FOR THE COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE)

HE001619

ED041537

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


INTRODUCTION . . . . . i

I. FACULTY WOMEN . . . . . 1

A. Women on the regular teaching faculties . . . . . 1
- Numbers and locations . . . . . 1
- The potential pools of faculty women . . . . . 4
- Recruitment procedures . . . . . 4
- Promotions and reappointments . . . . . 5
- Cases of alleged discrimination . . . . . 5
- Nepotism . . . . . 7
- Work patterns of faculty women . . . . . 7
- Reported satisfactions and dissatisfactions . . . . . 8
- Equity in faculty salaries . . . . . 9
- Salaries of married women . . . . . 14
- Women as teachers and researchers . . . . . 14
- Part-time appointments . . . . . 16
- Stretch-out to tenure . . . . . 16
- Changing career patterns . . . . . 17
- The tandem team . . . . . 17
- Child care . . . . . 18
- Summary . . . . . 19

B. Lecturers and research associates . . . . . 19
- Numbers and types of lecturers . . . . . 20
- Numbers of research associates . . . . . 23
- Satisfactions and dissatisfactions . . . . . 23
- Why are so many women in these positions? . . . . . 25
- Summary . . . . . 27

II. STUDENT WOMEN . . . . . 29

A. Background data . . . . . 29
- Trends in total enrollments . . . . . 29
- Degrees granted . . . . . 29

B. Admissions and aid . . . . . 32
- Proportions admitted who are women . . . . . 35
- Academic abilities of men and women . . . . . 35
- Recruitment efforts . . . . . 38
- Financial aid . . . . . 39
- Aid for tandem teams . . . . . 42

C. Attrition rates . . . . . 43
- Attitudes bearing on attrition: aspirations, motivations, perceived support . . . . . 43
- Attrition in the College . . . . . 44

D. Career plans of women . . . . . 47
Highest degree expected and field of study . . . . . 47
Undergraduate career counseling . . . . . 49
Graduate counseling and placement . . . . . 49

E. Older students . . . . . 50

F. Part-time students . . . . . 52
Child care . . . . . 52

G. Campus student life . . . . . 53
Student housing . . . . . 53
Gynecological services . . . . . 53
The student survey . . . . . 54
Courses on the subject of women . . . . . 54

III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . . 57

APPENDICES

A. How Visible Are Women in the Academic Community? . . . . . 63
Faculty awards and honors . . . . . 63
Honors to nonfaculty persons . . . . . 64
Academic administrative positions . . . . . 64

B. Earned Ph.D.s from Leading Universities, by Sex . . . . . 67

C. December 15 Decisions on Reappointments of Assistant Professors . . . . . 69

D. Developments in the Supply of Highly Educated Women . . . . . 71
Numbers of women faculty in U.S. . . . . 71
Characteristics of women faculty . . . . . 73
The increasing pool of college-educated women . . . . . 75
Proportions of women doctorates . . . . . 76
The returns from graduate education . . . . . 80
Family status, education, and labor force participation . . . . . 80
Fields of graduate study . . . . . 81

E. The Student Survey . . . . . 87
Sample and weighting . . . . . 87
Operational procedures . . . . . 87
Distribution of the questionnaire . . . . . 88
Response rates . . . . . 88
Summary of responses of student questionnaire . . . . . 89

F. Dissents and Comments . . . . . 113
General dissent . . . . . 120

## LIST OF TABLES


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Table 1 | Distribution of Teaching Faculty by Academic Unit, Rank, and Sex: Spring 1969 | 2 |
| Table 2 | Faculty Women for Whom Salary Data Were Analyzed | 12 |
| Table 3 | Average Ratios of a Woman's Salary to That of Her Male Match | 13 |
| Table 4 | Contributions of Faculty Women (Ratings by Chairmen) | 15 |
| Table 5 | Comparisons of Women with Their Male Matches (Ratings by Chairmen) | 15 |
| Table 6 | Lecturers in the University: By Academic Unit, Sex, and Category of Appointments (Spring 1969) | 21 |
| Table 7 | Research Associates in the University: By Academic Unit and Sex (Spring 1969) | 22 |
| Table 8 | Total Enrollment Data | 30 |
| Table 9 | Academic Degrees Awarded, 1968-69 | 31 |
| Table 10 | Admissions for 1967, 1968, 1969 (3-year Averages) | 33 |
| Table 11 | Academic Abilities of Applicants and Matriculants in the College, 1969 | 37 |
| Table 12 | For Students Who Were Accepted: Financial Aid Data for 1967, 1968, 1969 (3-year Averages) | 40 |
| Table 13 | Attrition in the College | 45 |
| Table 14 | Cohort Analyses for Selected Departments (Students Entered 1962, 1963, 1964) | 45 |
| Table 15 | Cohort Analyses for Students in Ford-supported Program in English (Students Entered 1964, 1965, 1966) | 45 |
| Appendix B | Earned Ph.D. Degrees from Leading Universities (by Sex) | 63 |
| Appendix C | December 15, 1969 Decisions on Reappointments of Assistant Professors | 64 |
| Table D.1 | Characteristics of Full-time Teaching Faculty (Instructor or Above) in Universities and 4-year Colleges, Spring 1963, by Sex | 71 |
| Table D.2 | Faculty and Other Professional Staff in Institutions of Higher Education, 1900-1964, by Sex | 74 |
| Table D.3 | Percent of High School Graduates Who Entered College, 1939-68, by Sex | 77 |
| Table D.4 | Percent Who Completed B.A. and First Professional Degrees, 1949-50 to 1967-68, by Sex | 77 |
| Table D.5 | Earned B.A. and First Professional Degrees, 1900-1968, by Sex | 78 |
| Table D.6 | Earned Doctorates Conferred, 1900-1968, by Sex | 79 |
| Table D.7 | Earned Doctorates by Field and by Sex, 1920-68 | 83 |
| Table D.8 | Earned Doctorates in Selected Fields of Study, 1957-58 and 1967-68, by Sex | 83 |
| Table D.9 | Subject Matter Fields Ranked by Ratio of Female to Male Doctorates | 85 |
| Table E.1 | Highest Degree Expected, by Sex and Academic Unit (Unweighted), Percent | 112 |

# INTRODUCTION

The Committee on University Women, appointed in May 1969, was charged by the Committee of the Council of the University Senate to inquire into the status and opportunities open to academic women on this campus, giving special attention to the question of equity regarding salaries, promotion, and tenure for faculty women. We were invited also to inquire into such related matters and to make such recommendations as we thought appropriate.

The Committee has taken the latter part of the mandate at least as seriously as the first. Our initial step was to form a subcommittee to be concerned with problems of student women. The subcommittee has been composed of three faculty members of the Committee plus six students elected by a group of representatives named by Student Government, the Faculty Student Advisory Committee on Campus Student Life, and the various student-faculty councils. Thereafter we have operated as a group of overlapping task forces, each composed of the two or three persons whose special interests or special skills made them the most appropriate persons to pursue a particular problem or question. We have been sensitive to issues of confidentiality and anonymity and decided early to follow a policy of limiting confidential information, even within the Committee itself, to only those individuals who had a clear "need to know." This means that no member of the Committee, including the chairman, has had access to all the data in their original form. In signing this report we are therefore signifying participation throughout the year in the work of the Committee as a whole, in the discussion of task force memoranda, and consent to the general findings and recommendations,* but not agreement with every point of view expressed in the introduction or in the body of the report. Where significant dissents or additional comments exist, they are called to attention by an asterisk at the appropriate places in the report (as in the previous sentence) and are made explicit in Appendix F.

It will come as no revelation to the reader that the status of women in this University, their achievements and their frustrations, are inextricably intertwined with the larger question of the position of women in the broader society. A host of technological, economic, cultural, and political factors are at work altering the lives of women—to mention only a few: the increasing longevity of women as compared to men, acceleration of the events that constitute the family cycle, new controls over parenthood, increasing proportions of highly-educated women who marry, increasing proportions who undertake high-status occupational careers and who choose to create differing patterns of work and family commitments at successive periods in adulthood. The opportunities open to women and the problems they face will probably change in the next ten years even more rapidly than in the past.

We recognize that this report emerges at a time when a new awareness of women's needs is coming to national attention; and it is inevitable that each member of the Committee should hold strong convictions and highly-charged personal views. Not all of us, naturally enough, hold the same views regarding the directions for needed social change, the ways in which the relations between the sexes can or should be modified, or what the role of the University should be in these regards. We have not attempted to reconcile our differences on any broader scale than necessary to produce a report focussed on the local issues at hand.

In somewhat different words, this Committee has chosen this occasion neither to attempt an analysis of the present situation of women in American society nor to play the roles of futurologists. We believe, however, that both the opportunities and the obstacles faced by women—particularly those who are highly educated—pose numerous complicated and stubborn problems and that there will be no quick and easy solutions.

In narrowing our perspective, therefore, we have asked how The University of Chicago, given its special characteristcs and special educational goals, can best discharge its responsibilities toward women. We have concluded that the primary task is to insure that we recruit, then encourage, talented and dedicated women as well as men students and faculty, and to insure that the University is making the most of its opportunities in regard to both the talent pool from which it draws and the talent pool to which it contributes. In short, we should be making every effort to insure the full participation and the contributions of women in pursuing the overall goal of the University for academic preeminence. This means that the University is not generally well suited to providing continuing education for a heterogeneous population of women students, or for creating new career lines, or even training women for the wide variety of occupations now open to them.* Nothing in the report to follow, therefore, is intended to deflect this University from pursuing that which it does best—namely, preparing gifted undergraduates for the most demanding graduate programs, preparing college and university teachers, training professionals in a half-dozen strategic areas, and especially training creative researchers as an integral part of the process of producing new knowledge. The questions before our Committee, then, have been to inquire into the possible differential treatment of women on this campus in pursuit of these goals and to find out how to create an environment that will be equally supportive of academic achievement by men and women.

To narrow the focus even further, there are a few persons on this campus who believe that women have neither special contributions to make to the life of the University nor special problems; that in the sense that the individual's sex is irrelevant to his or her intellectual achievement, so should the University pursue a course which is blind to the differences between men and women, selecting and educating solely on the basis of intellectual potential. There are others who hold that women experience processes of socialization so different from men that all but a few are handicapped in their roles as students—and, by extension, in their roles as faculty members—and that this University unthinkingly reinforces the wider society in these respects, thereby exacerbating the problems for academic women. There are also some who believe that the University acts in deliberate ways to hinder the achievements of women.

Most of our Committee, not unexpectedly, take none of these positions. On the one hand we find that our interviews and other sets of data have revealed a sense of efficiency and free choice in most women on this campus. On the other hand, we do not hold that women have no special needs or special problems, nor that this University has taken all the positive steps it should take in recruiting able women students and faculty, in making adjustments that would improve their lives in the University, or in advancing their talents.

We have identified various problems among women students and women faculty, but we recognize that many of these problems are also faced by men students and men faculty. Such problems as may be specific to women in the University stem not from differences in intellectual abilities between the sexes but from differences in experiences and goals and from the obstacles characteristic of the wider

society and reflected to some extent within the University. Given that the problems are primarily social in origin, many relate to role expectations.* The inherently reciprocal relationship between men's and women's roles means inevitably that to alter one is to alter the other. In making recommendations about women, then, we are also frequently making recommendations about men.

It should be pointed out that The University of Chicago, despite its auspicious beginnings as a place where distinguished women were part of the original faculty and where special encouragement was given to student women, no longer occupies the same position of leadership in this regard. From various sets of data to follow, it appears that we are doing little better than other major universities when it comes to proportion of faculty women, proportion and distribution of student women throughout the graduate divisions and schools, or to furthering the academic and professional contributions of women. This is a troublesome state of affairs. To the extent that it becomes the concern of all members of the University community, it can be anticipated that progressive steps beyond those formulated by this Committee will begin to appear. It is for this reason that we invite the deliberation of all our colleagues in helping to place the University once again in the forefront of educational institutions with regard to the intellectually gifted woman.

One additional comment: In our investigations we have encountered the unsurprising fact that academic processes teem with areas of discretionary decision-making. The motives and calculations that enter into any exercise of discretion are difficult to determine, but we must assume that the fact of femininity often enters into discretionary judgments concerning students who are women and faculty who are women. It also seems likely that traditional, more than innovative, views concerning women's roles are still coloring discretionary judgments.

In suggesting safeguards against potentially inequitable situations, it is tempting to advocate tighter institutional procedures at points of uncertainty and ambiguity, to insist on absolute symmetry in all decision-making situations. We have done so only rarely in this report, because we believe variety and lack of rigidity are important both for universities and for women. Instead of specifying more rigid procedures—whose operation for or against women cannot always be predicted—we have at numerous points in the report urged upon departmental chairmen and other officers certain concerns, cautions, and states of awareness. What these repeated exhortations amount to is a belief that though structural changes in the University can sometimes help women, more often the spirit in which discretion is exercised makes the greater difference.

If these exhortations are not to go the way of other pious hopes, and if their expectations are not to depend too heavily on the insight of department chairmen and deans, women in the University may have to learn to further their interests more persistently than they have to date. Through alertness to their own situation, through persistent articulation of their needs and perceptions, and through imaginative institutional innovation, these women must take additional responsibility for creating their environments in line with their professional needs. In short, not only is greater awareness required on the part of men, but also more self-awareness on the part of women.

To return now to the report itself, and our procedures: in gathering information, we decided to act for the most part as our own staff. While this decision often resulted in unanticipated demands upon individual members of the Committee, students as well as faculty, it provided certain flexibilities in pursuing our inquiries that would not otherwise have been possible.

We have undertaken numerous tasks. We first wrote letters to all women on the faculty, including research associates and lecturers, inviting them to comment on any matter they regarded as relevant to the position of women on this campus, whether based on personal or vicarious experience. We issued the same invitation to all members of the University community through notices in *The Maroon* and on bulletin boards. In response we obtained many thoughtful letters and many valuable suggestions from both men and women.

Subsequently we undertook a systematic program of interviewing all women in the University who are members of the teaching faculties, lecturers, and research associates; all chairmen of departments and degree-granting committees; masters of collegiate divisions; and all academic deans. These interviews covered a wide range of topics; and, as will be evident from the report to follow, we have drawn heavily from information thus obtained.

In November 1969, we held five hours of open hearings, and a number of worthwhile comments and suggestions emerged from the written and oral presentations made to us on that occasion by individuals and by representatives of various women's organizations.

In addition we have held innumerable formal and informal conversations with junior and senior male colleagues, with administrative officers, and with other staff members in all parts of the University; we have administered a questionnaire to some 1,100 undergraduate and graduate men and women students, sampling from each of the divisions and professional schools, and we have gathered various types of data from administrative offices of the University.

Because of limited time and resources the Committee decided at the outset to exclude the faculties of the University Laboratory Schools from its considerations, as well as "field work" academic personnel. In studying the problems of women, we have not given specific attention to racial, religious, or ethnic subgroups for the purpose of identifying further problems they may experience.

A number of our tasks became inordinately difficult because of the inadequate record keeping that we encountered in various parts of the University with regard to faculty matters no less than to student matters. Data collection and record keeping have evidently been items of low priority in a University in which—fortunately for us all—the academic preoccupations have overshadowed the administrative. At the same time the University would be well served if more attention could be given to certain record keeping functions on the basis of which we might better estimate the success with which we are meeting our goals.

The frustrations reflected in the last comment have, on the other hand, been outweighed by the enormous degree of cooperation that has been forthcoming from students, faculty, administrators, and staff members who have assisted us over the past months.

We are particularly indebted to that group of students who came to be known as "resource persons" in working with our subcommittee during the spring and summer, especially Suzanne Gwiazda, Judith Baer, Martha Smith, Hedda Ribolow, Nancy Hartsock, Beth Goldring, Hilda Smith, and Deborah Leveen; and the two alternate members of the subcommittee, Donna Rankin and Margaret Huyck. We wish to make special acknowledgment also to Ruth Kraines, Betty Goldiamond, Julia Lewis, and Alice Chandler who helped to collect various sets of data; to Judith Laws and Eve Weinberg who advised in the formulation of the student questionnaire and to Ellen Fried who supervised its

construction and administration; to Carol LeFevre who contributed to the data on married women students; to Roger Weiss who contributed the data on academic abilities of College students shown in Table 11; to Susan Schwerin and Kathleen Hanson who assisted the subcommittee; and to Bernice Spivek and Ellen Fritsch who assisted in the preparation of the manuscript.

Signed:[1]

Norman M. Bradburn, Professor of Behavioral Sciences, Graduate School of Business

Jo Freeman, graduate student in Political Science

Rosemarie Gillespie, graduate student in Social Sciences

Catherine Ham, Assistant Professorial Lecturer, Department of English

Mary Jennings Johns, graduate student in Educational Psychology

Barbara Buggert Lane, undergraduate student in Public Affairs

Ann M. Lawrence, M.D., Associate Professor of Medicine

H. Gregg Lewis, Professor of Economics

Soia Mentschikoff, Professor of Law

Jane Overton, Associate Professor of Biology

Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, Associate Professor of Political Science

Barbara Waugh, graduate student in Theology and Literature

Bernice L. Neugarten, Professor of Human Development, Chairman

[1]Judith Cherniak, undergraduate student in the New Collegiate Division, has been on leave of absence since summer 1969, and therefore participated only for a brief period; and J. Alan Thomas, Professor of Education, found it necessary in light of other commitments to resign from the Committee in November 1969.

# I. FACULTY WOMEN

Academic positions in the University are of two general types—appointments to the regular academic ladder and appointments outside the ladder, sometimes referred to as "fringe appointments." Regular academic appointments, for which periodic reviews are provided, range from instructor to professor. The reviews may eventuate in termination of contract, reappointment, promotion, and promotion to tenure. Ladder positions bring with them the various fringe benefits attaching to regular faculty status.

Persons on "fringe" appointments as lecturers and research associates do not occupy this ladder. They hold contracts of varying lengths, usually on a one-year basis, reflecting the fact that funds are often made available in the University for special purposes or for carrying out specific research projects of limited duration. They do not have faculty voting privileges. Appointments as lecturer or research associate do not carry with them the presumption of promotion; and while they provide varying fringe benefits, these fringe benefits are usually less than those provided for regular faculty members. These appointments are flexible in a double sense. On the one hand, incumbents do not necessarily meet the conventional requirements for faculty status in terms of formal qualifications and time commitments; on the other hand, they do not benefit from the regularized procedures and other advantages of faculty status.

Because the University's records have not previously been arrayed in this way, it has taken an enormous effort to produce the basic data shown in Tables 1, 6, and 7 to follow. These tables show the numbers of regular teaching faculty, lecturers, and research associates by academic unit, rank, and sex in this University in the spring of 1969. We believe the tables to be accurate, and we have proceeded on this basis in our mail solicitations and interviews of faculty women and in our investigation of the matters entrusted to us by the Council in establishing this Committee.

## A. Women on the Regular Teaching Faculties

Women constituted 7.3 percent of the regular teaching faculties in spring 1969 (87 of 1,189). The percentage falls slightly to 7 percent if the Department of Physical Education is eliminated from the figures, as it seems to us it should, since sex differentiation in appointment in that department seems inevitable.

### *Numbers and Locations*

The overall figure is considerably below the average for all universities (see Appendix D), but it compares favorably, so far as we have been able to ascertain, with those universities which, like The University of Chicago, view themselves as "elite." These "elite" universities generally have smaller numbers of women on their faculties than do other universities. Comparisons between universities are difficult to make without careful examination of the particular academic categories included in the term "faculty"; nor are such comparisons meaningful without attention to the particular departments and

TABLE 1

Distribution of Teaching Faculty by Academic Unit, Rank, and Sex: Spring 1969

| Area | Professor | | Assoc. Prof. | | Asst. Prof. | | Instructor | | Total | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | |
| *Divisions* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Biological Sciences[a] | 117 | 0 | 89 | 4 | 95 | 21 | 50 | 6 | 351 | 31 | 382 |
| Humanities | 77 | 2 | 35 | 3 | 66 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 185 | 15 | 200 |
| Physical Sciences | 84 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 147 | 1 | 148 |
| Social Sciences | 106 | 1 | 36 | 1 | 58 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 208 | 13 | 221 |
| *College*[b] | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Biology | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
| Humanities | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| Physical Sciences | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Social Sciences | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| New Collegiate Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| *Schools* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Business | 37 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 70 | 1 | 71 |
| Divinity | 17 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 |
| Graduate Education | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 14 |
| Graduate Library | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 9 |
| Law | 21 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 33 | 1 | 34 |
| Social Service Administration | 5 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 8 | 31 |
| *Physical Education* | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| Total | 475 | 11 | 217 | 16 | 308 | 45 | 102 | 15 | 1,102 | 87 | 1,189 |

[a] Faculty of The Pritzker School of Medicine are included in the Division of the Biological Sciences.

[b] Faculty who have appointments only in the collegiate divisions. Most members of the collegiate divisions hold appointments also in the divisions and schools.

schools which compose different universities. Some traditionally "women's fields," such as Home Economics or Nursing Education, for example, which raise the total number of women faculty, no longer exist at The University of Chicago.

Because this University, furthermore, is one in which considerable autonomy is left to individual departments, divisions, and schools, the overall figure is perhaps of less significance than the question of where women are to be found in various parts of the University.

Women comprised the following percentages of the regular teaching faculties in the graduate divisions: 8 percent of the Biological Sciences, 8 percent of the Humanities, 6 percent of the Social Sciences, and less than 1 percent of the Physical Sciences. If we include those faculty who held appointments only in the undergraduate College, the percentages by subject matter area become 9, 8, 6, and 0.7. These percentages, again so far as we have been able to discover, were compatible with national figures for similar institutions, as were the percentages for the College alone (27 percent); the School of Social Service Administration (26 percent); the Graduate Library School (22 percent); the Graduate School of Education (7 percent); the Law School (3 percent); and the Graduate School of Business (1 percent). Nor, in comparison with other universities, was it extraordinary to find no women in the Divinity School in spring 1969.

The compatability of percentages may reflect merely a national elitist bias against the appointment of women. Accordingly, the Committee attempted to estimate the pool of potential faculty members; and we sought to ascertain by interviews the recruiting and hiring practices of each of the departments and schools. Before discussing the results of these investigations, a few observations as to the ranks of women faculty are in order.

The first thing to be noted is that in spring 1969, only eleven women held professorial rank, and, if Physical Education is excluded, only thirteen women held associate professorial rank. In other words, women constituted 2 percent of the professors and 6 percent of the associate professors, or a total of 3 percent of the tenured faculty. The fact that women earned 15 to 18 percent of all Ph.D. degrees in the United States in the decades of the 1930s and 1940s, and 10 percent or more in more recent years, begins to suggest something of the scope of the questions that have preoccupied this Committee.

The subject matter areas of the tenured women is also worthy of note. Six of the twenty-four were in Social Service Administration, traditionally a "woman's field," where they constituted 43 percent of the tenured faculty and more than half of the full professors. Five were in the Humanities Division (two professors in the Oriental Institute, one associate professor in Classics, and two associate professors in languages). Four associate professors were in the Biological Sciences Division, working primarily in the Medical School. Two were in the Social Sciences—one professor in Human Development and one associate professor who taught mainly in the College. Two associate professors were in the Graduate Library School, two in the Biology Collegiate Division, and one in the Social Sciences Collegiate Division. One professor was in the Physical Sciences Division, but taught primarily in the College, and one was in the Law School.

This distribution of tenured women has certain immediately obvious implications. With the exception of students in the Social Service, Law, Medical, and Library Schools and in the Departments

of Classics, languages, and the Committee on Human Development, graduate students are unlikely to come into contact with a woman who is a tenured member of the faculty. Students in the College, although they may be exposed to a few women associate professors, are almost equally certain to have most of their contacts with women at junior faculty ranks. (For reasons to become evident in later sections of this report, the perceptions of women on this faculty as being relatively low in status is perhaps particularly significant among students in the social sciences.)

Perhaps the most significant fact is that there are many departments in this University (twenty-nine of a total of fifty-six degree-granting units) where there were no women faculty at all.

Given the small number of women on the faculties and their overrepresentation at lower academic ranks, it is not surprising that women appear infrequently in positions of special recognition on this campus. Some of the data which demonstrate the latter point appear in Appendix A.

*Potential Pools of Faculty Women*

The paucity of women on The University of Chicago faculties has most often been explained, in our interviews with chairmen, deans, and other faculty, as due to the fact that qualified women are not available. To help evaluate this statement, we have accumulated the data in Appendix B, showing the numbers of men and women who earned Ph.D. degrees from the ten leading American universities in each of twenty-five fields over two five-year intervals. Each of these fields is represented by a graduate department at The University of Chicago. The table shows that, although the number of women Ph.D.s varies greatly from field to field, many of the pools nevertheless contain substantial proportions of women. We recognize that these data are at best indirect; that the Ph.D. is not itself sufficient evidence of excellence or suitability; and that many talented women, just as is true of men, might not be attracted to faculty positions at this University for a wide variety of reasons. Not least among these reasons is the fact that increasingly large proportions of Ph.D. women are married and may not be free to accept positions here even if offered.

Nevertheless it is not easy for the Committee to believe that no women of excellence appeared in these pools or that no women of excellence would be willing to join such elite departments here as English or Anthropology, to name but two. Nor are we fully persuaded that no women of distinction exist in fields such as Sociology or Psychology, where the pools have always been rather large, nor that no distinguished woman in such fields would be willing to join departments at The University of Chicago which in spring 1969 were without tenured women.

*Recruitment Procedures*

We believe that this situation may reflect rather the relatively unsystematic way in which almost all departments and schools go about their recruitment of faculty. No source of excellence should be overlooked in faculty recruitment; yet the procedures which have been described to us (frequently as the "grapevine" method) lead us to question whether not only women but also men of excellence fail to be discovered.*

*We are, therefore, recommending that each department and school review its recruitment precedures to determine whether, in fact, they are exploring the total pool of excellence, especially with regard to women. For example, in making oral or written inquiries the department should specify that it is interested in hearing about able women as well as able men.*

A special problem of recruitment relates to the married woman whose husband is also an academic. We shall return to this question later in discussing the "tandem team."

Another matter of concern to the Committee in connection with recruitment was the statement of women in the School of Social Service Administration that men had in recent years been given preferential treatment. The vastly different ratios in that School between men and women in tenured and nontenured positions seem to support this allegation (six of eleven full professors there are women, but only two of the seventeen assistant professors). The women in that School were divided as to the desirability of this practice, with most of them believing it was necessary to the development of the School and with conviction that it has not resulted in any dilution of quality.

The Committee recognizes the argument that it may be desirable to provide male models in a traditionally woman's field (just as it recognizes the parallel argument of the desirability of providing female models in traditionally men's fields). If this is indeed the justification, it appears to have been carried to an extreme in this instance. More important, however, we question a second assumption—that the influx of a large number of men raises the level of professionalization, or even that, rightly or wrongly, it raises the prestige of the field and should therefore be encouraged. If the School of Social Service Administration is giving preferential treatment to men on grounds of the last-mentioned assumption or if this policy is being carried on at the expense of excellence, we urge the discontinuance of this policy.

*Promotions and Reappointments*

Because the necessary data are lacking, we have not been able to make a systematic study of promotions to tenure and renewals of contracts to see if differences in turnover rates, if they exist, can be attributed to differential treatment. We have interviewed chairmen, masters, and deans regarding the procedures currently being used in each department, collegiate division, and school and find that, as described to us, the procedures are not discriminatory as between sexes.* Regarding actual practice, however, we have very little data.

*Cases of Alleged Discrimination*

Three cases of alleged discrimination in 1969 were called to our attention, two by the women concerned, the third by students during our public hearings. The faculty task force assigned to this problem found, on investigation, that the first case apparently resulted from a failure of communication between the department head and the woman faculty member. When communication was reestablished the matter was satisfactorily adjusted. In the second and third cases, it was found that the academic units concerned had followed their customary procedures and that these procedures were not themselves discriminatory as between men and women.[2] The faculty Committee has not considered itself

[2]In one of these instances, the woman was offered (and accepted) a reappointment she regarded as less favorable than she deserved; in the other, the woman found the terms of reappointment unsatisfactory and chose to leave the University.

a body to review the merits of any individual case and has not done so, since it is not qualified to judge the achievements of faculty members located in many different units of the University.

Some faculty members told us also about three other alleged instances of discrimination in earlier years. We have not been able to investigate satisfactorily the procedures followed, nor have we, again, attempted to act as a review body for these three earlier casts. We note that while the total number of instances in which discrimination has been alleged has been small, these cases have created concern in some faculty members of both sexes. Although the prevailing climate of opinion regarding the status of women on this campus may or may not be consonant with the facts, it is nevertheless itself a matter of great importance because it constitutes a social reality of its own. The fact that doubts exist in the minds of some faculty regarding discrimination is itself cause for concern to this Committee. We recognize that the issues are complex with regard to such allegations in the case of individual faculty members, because they involve delicate problems of confidentiality on the one hand and needs for open communication on the other. While we have no easy solution to offer, the Committee calls attention to the need for all members of the University to remain alert to this problem of improving the network of communication.

Apart from the three instances in 1969 and the reports of the past, the only other data we have are in a report from the Provost of all actions taken in December 1969 with respect to renewals and promotions to tenure for assistant professors and instructors.[3] A summary of that report appears as Appendix C. The relative percentages of favorable and unfavorable actions do not vary significantly between men and women for the decisions made in December 1969. The Committee has been unable to obtain similar data for previous years.

It may be relevant also that in our interviews with faculty women, a few complained about speed of promotion; but because we have not interviewed a systematic sample of faculty men, we cannot estimate whether these complaints are proportionately more or less frequent than with men. Although we inquired of chairmen and deans about women who have left the University in the past few years, we have similarly been unable to determine whether or not the reasons for their leaving distinguish them from men who have left.*

Finally, we believe that the question of promotions and tenure cannot be fully considered without investigation of the role played by women as lecturers and research associates (which is discussed below) and the dead hand of the "nepotism rule" which operated for many years as a bar to faculty ladder appointments for women married to men in the same field. It developed in the course of our interviewing that the relatively recent statement of University policy on nepotism (report of the Lorie Committee, December 1967) is not generally known. In fact the "rule" is now nonexistent. That University policy in this regard was a bar in earlier years cannot be denied and may explain in part the relatively small group of tenured faculty who are women. Two members of this Committee have been affected by the rule—one carrying the title of Professorial Lecturer for many years, the other carrying an appointment in the College only, rather than a joint College-Division appointment. In the physical sciences the case of a distinguished woman who, together with her husband, was lost to the University

[3]The University Statutes provide that an instructor in the fourth year of appointment or an assistant professor in the final year of his initial term be notified by December 15 of termination or reappointment, and by the same date an assistant professor in the last year of his second term be notified of termination or promotion.

has been repeatedly brought to our attention. There are other alleged instances which we have not explored in depth in view of the present status of the rule. Our recommendations with respect to nepotism appear in the next section of this report.

As part of our inquiry into the life patterns of women faculty members, the Committee also explored the age at which women achieved professorial status as possibly bearing on the issue of rate of promotion. The range was from thirty-two to fifty-five, and when viewed in the context of the particular life patterns involved, this information did not indicate any inequality of treatment.

*Nepotism*

The Committee discussed at some length the possible effects of University policy regarding nepotism on both the recruitment and promotion of women faculty, reviewing the pros and cons of previous as well as current policy. We are gratified that this policy has been altered in recent years toward greater flexibility (witnessed by the fact that at least four married couples presently hold tenured appointments within the same divisions and three couples within the same departments; other husband-wife teams are to be found in junior faculty ranks). Present policy, as set forth by the Lorie Committee in December 1967, does not proscribe but merely warns against the appointment of close relatives to the same academic unit.

The major issue in connection with this policy is that to appoint close relatives to the same academic unit involves the same risk as to appoint a department's own recent graduate—namely that such an appointment might be, or might be interpreted as, an outcome of convenience or complacency rather than the outcome of a careful search for excellence.

In the course of our interviewing we encountered members of the University community, even a few chairmen, who were unaware of current policy and who believed that under no circumstances could close relatives be appointed to their department.

*We therefore recommend that the current interpretation of the University's policy be more widely publicized by a statement from the Provost distributed to all academic employees. We recommend further that such a statement forego the terms "nepotism" and "anti-nepotism" and that it be couched primarily in terms of anti-favoritism.* The statement should, on the one hand, warn individual faculties or chairmen of possible problems of collegiality and/or conflict of interest that may arise from the appointment of close relatives; on the other hand, it should make explicit that current interpretations are, and are meant to be, more flexible than the old nepotism convention, under which injustices resulted more often for women than for men and which led sometimes to the loss of talent to the University.

*Work Patterns of Faculty Women*

Certain clichés are sometimes voiced that women are worse risks than men as prospects for permanent faculty. As already indicated, a comparison of men and women who have left The University of Chicago was beyond our resources of time and money. Through interviews with faculty women,

however, we were able to identify certain recurrent life patterns which negate most such clichés. We suspect that the departure of a woman is often uncritically regarded as related to her sex, while the departures of men are seldom so interpreted. But we have no proof of this.

Of the present eighty-seven faculty women, fifty-two have married and thirty-five are single. The proportions married are roughly the same at successive academic ranks. There have been three recurrent work patterns for those who are married with children: 1) continuous full-time work despite marriage and childbearing, a pattern that was particularly evident for those whose husbands were also academics; 2) a move from full-time to part-time work, or temporary withdrawal for periods of childbearing and childrearing, followed by return to full-time; 3) a move from part-time research or teaching to full-time faculty status as childrearing ends. The single women and the married women without children have maintained patterns of employment as continuous as their male counterparts. There is thus no single "female pattern." Much seems to turn on factors such as the temperament of the women concerned, the nature and vocational activity of the spouse, the allocation of household duties between husband and wife, the availability of grandparent or other relatives as "live-ins," and the availability of other child care arrangements.

Apparently there is and has been enormous flexibility on the part of chairmen and deans in making arrangements to keep the women, as well as the men, they want to keep. For at least the present group of faculty women, the Committee is impressed with the extent to which mutually satisfactory arrangements have been worked out to accommodate their needs. ***We recommend that the flexibility utilized in the past in terms of shifts from research associate to teaching faculty, part-time to full-time work and vice versa, leaves of absence, maternity leaves, and the like be continued, since it has made it possible to retain women of high calibre who might otherwise have been lost to the University.***

*Reported Satisfactions and Dissatisfactions*

As already indicated, we attempted to interview all the women on the faculty after an earlier letter inviting their written comments, suggestions, and criticisms. Both actions were taken with assurances of confidentiality, and we believe we obtained full and frank responses. One woman refused to be interviewed and a few others could not be reached in the time allotted for this part of the Committee's work. As a result we have relatively detailed information from all but two of the tenured, and from 75 percent of the nontenured faculty who are women.

As a group the faculty women reported high satisfaction with the roles they play. The great majority spontaneously described their work situations as gratifying and their positions as ones that provided great freedom to pursue their teaching and research interests in ways that were personally rewarding. Even when the interviewer brought problems to their attention that they had not previously considered, most women felt no need for change in the practices or operations of the University as these practices might affect them.* For example, the great majority did not see any role to be played by an ombudsman for women only; and most did not favor such an office even for both sexes, saying that channels of communication with chairmen and deans were open and satisfactory. So, too, most saw no special role to be played by faculty women with respect to student women, although many recognized that they might be viewed as models by students and that this view might impose on them special duties and responsibilities. Most faculty women favored maximum flexibility with regard to full- and part-time

appointments and leaves of absence, but on the whole they thought the same flexibility should be available to men as well as to women. (As we have indicated before, that flexibility already exists, and we have recommended its continuance.) Many commented that although most women have family responsibilities that pose career problems different from those of men, and that these should be taken into consideration in the individual case, any moves toward providing special arrangements for women as a group might have deleterious effects in the long run. In this vein, for example, most faculty women thought no specific University policy was needed regarding maternity leaves because satisfactory arrangements were already being made in most cases; and, to take a different example, almost without exception they opposed the creation of any special professorships for women (positions on these issues are much the same as those which emerged from our interviews with chairmen and deans).

It may be unnecessary to remind the reader that the interviewees are those women who have remained at the University and that, had our Committee been able to interview those who have left, the picture might have been somewhat different.

The concern most commonly raised by the present faculty women (though not by a majority) was whether there was salary equivalence with their male counterparts. One woman, a member of a husband-wife team, also raised the question of whether as a team they were less well paid than two nonrelated faculty of comparable rank. We were not able to answer this last question, but we believe that department chairmen and deans should be alert to this kind of problem, since it is likely to arise more frequently in the future, and even though we recognize that the marketability of a pair—even when both are very distinguished—is likely to be more difficult than the marketability of a single person. With regard to the question of salary equity, the Committee undertook a special study reported in the section to follow, a study based on University records and carried out independently from such information regarding salaries as was volunteered in the interviews.

Another significant point needs to be made. A number of faculty women expressed a feeling of isolation, resting in part on their belief that male colleagues did not or would not welcome them as persons with whom to discuss ongoing research or to share other forms of collegiality. While most women did not, in fact, express such feelings, we bring this matter to the attention of the faculty as a whole because we believe that most male faculty do not in truth have these attitudes and that some unnecessary discomfort can easily be alleviated if they are made aware of the problem. Some junior women felt that senior members of their departments were not friendly because they, the junior faculty, were women. To the small extent that we looked into this matter, it appeared that senior faculty were perceived as distant from junior faculty by some persons of both sexes, since a number of junior faculty men have made the same comment. We do not know how junior faculty men explain to themselves the apparent lack of interest by senior faculty, but perhaps this is a general problem that warrants more attention from senior faculty.

*Equity in Faculty Salaries*

The Committee of the Council of the University Senate explicitly asked us to explore the question of equity between faculty women and men with regard to salary.

It may be a relevant reminder, first, that the rewards offered by the University to an academic employee consist not only of salary in the conventional meaning of that word, but also of a package of

pecuniary fringe benefits and another package of nonpecuniary benefits. The latter include such things as the prestige of the University as the faculty member sees it, the opportunities for gainful employment for one's spouse, the schooling opportunities available for one's children, the congeniality of colleagues, and so on.

It goes without saying that both the University and the individual employee operate within the economic marketplace and that both consider nonpecuniary as well as pecuniary rewards. The University cannot expect to employ for long a person to whom it offers a total of rewards smaller than that which he or she can earn elsewhere. Of course, not all faculty members are equally skilled, diligent, or lucky in seeking out alternative offers.

It is relevant to point out for those who are not already familiar with the larger context regarding salaries that the University does not pursue a "single" or fixed salary schedule; that salaries vary within the same academic rank as well as between various parts of the University; and that, on the average, University of Chicago salaries, based on data compiled by the American Association of University Professors, are with the exception of one other university to whom it stands a very close second, the highest among American universities.

Question: Do the rewards received by academic women in the University differ significantly on the average from those received by men who are the equals of the women in terms of amount and kind of talent and of dedication of their talent to University employment?

We have not tried to answer this question regarding the total *rewards* of men and women simply because of the difficulty of estimating each person's valuation of the fringe benefit and nonpecuniary aspects of University employment. We have tried to answer a similar question regarding *salaries*, but only for the regular faculty (instructors and persons of higher rank) in the academic departments and schools, involving a total of eighty-one women in spring 1969. Salary equality does not imply reward equality. In particular, we cannot assume that the circumstances and tastes of academic women in the University are so similar to those of their male "equals" that on the average salary differences between men and women measure reward differences.

Even for salaries the question is a very difficult one, since the male equals of the women faculty members can be only roughly approximated.[4] To approach the issue of comparability, we decided to search for the male equals of the women within the same rank and academic unit—department, school, or collegiate division.

Initially we asked the chairman of each department having at least one female faculty member to rate each woman and each of her male colleagues on a four-point rating scale: 1) outstanding, exceptional; 2) above average; 3) average; 4) below average, poor. The chairmen were instructed to rate each person (in comparison with all persons in the same department and rank over the past five to seven years) on an overall basis in terms of the faculty member's contributions to the department and to the University. Rating large numbers of faculty men proved a burdensome task for some chairmen, deans,

[4]We restricted the salary comparisons to the regular teaching faculty because we felt that it would be even more difficult to approximate male-female equality of talent and dedication among other academic personnel of the University.

and masters; and we soon modified the original request and asked instead that they select and rate, for each woman, the man in the department most nearly matching her in terms of date and rank of initial University appointment.[5]

It should be pointed out that these ratings were requested without mention of the fact that they might be used in studying the question of salary equity. The ratings were intended first to help us explore the nature and quality of the contributions being made by women faculty; and only as our inquiry progressed did it become clear that they provided a useful basis for analyzing salary data. We cannot be sure, however, that all chairmen disregard salary information in providing us with male matches; and to the extent that some did not, bias might have been introduced. From our interviews with chairmen carried out in the subsequent months, we believe that if instances of bias exist in these matches, they probably go in both directions; and that, on the whole, bias in making the matches does not constitute a significant shortcoming in these data.

For sixty-three of the eighty-one women, the chairmen or deans provided male matches in which both members of the pair were of the same rank and field. In the eighteen other cases, the absence of a man in the same rank and field, or the uniqueness of the functions, responsibilities, or experience of the woman made it impossible to find an approximate male match. Moreover, eight of the sixty-three cases in which male matches were named involved either a woman on a part-time basis or a male match who was or had been a dean. These eight cases were therefore excluded, leaving us with fifty-five pairs, or 68 percent of the eighty-one women.

Table 2 shows distribution of both the women in the fifty-five pairs and the total of eighty-one women by rank and by academic unit. The fifty-five pairs include only a few professors but a large majority of the women at the other ranks; 90 percent of the women in the College and in the Social Sciences Division, but only 38 percent of the women in the professional schools.

Table 3 summarizes the salary comparisons for the fifty-five matched pairs. The averages in the table are arithmetic means of the ratios of women's salary to salary of male match. (The estimated standard error of the mean salary ratio over all fifty-five was 1.1 percent.)[6]

(To spell out this procedure in exact terms: The salaries of the two persons in a matched pair are expressed in terms of the ratio of woman to man. If a woman is earning $100 and the man is earning $101, the ratio is 0.99; if the reverse is true, the ratio is 1.01. It is the average of these ratios which is shown in Table 3 for successive groups of matched pairs. It should be clear, accordingly, that there are

[5]We discovered later that some chairmen were asked to select for each woman the man most nearly matching her in terms of present overall contribution to the department and to the University. This lack of uniformity in instructions is regrettable, but it has had the effect, so far as we can tell, not of introducing a systematic bias in the data but of perhaps increasing the number of pairs of "woman and man rated the same" in Table 3.

[6]To maintain confidentiality the salary and ratings data underlying the table have been seen by only one member of the Committee. The salary figures used are the current salaries, except in a few pairs where spring 1969 figures were used because of the resignation or appointment termination of one or both members of the pair. In a few pairs in which one member of the pair was appointed for three academic quarters and the other for four, the appropriate adjustment was made.

TABLE 2

Faculty Women for Whom Salary Data Were Analyzed

| Rank or Academic Unit | Number in Total (81) | Number Included in 55 Matched Pairs | Percent Included in 55 Pairs |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Rank*[a] | | | |
| Professor | 11 | 2 | 18 |
| Associate Professor | 15 | 10 | 67 |
| Assistant Professor | 42 | 34 | 81 |
| Instructor | 13 | 9 | 69 |
| *Academic Unit*[b] | | | |
| College | 20 | 18 | 90 |
| Social Sciences Division | 10 | 9 | 90 |
| Humanities Division | 9 | 6 | 67 |
| Biological Sciences Division | 29 | 17 | 59 |
| Professional Schools | 13 | 5 | 38 |
| Total | 81 | 55 | 68 |

[a] As of autumn 1969.

[b] For persons on joint appointment, the classification is according to the unit with the larger fraction of the budgeted salary.

TABLE 3

Average Ratios of a Woman's Salary to That of Her Male Match

| Rating Comparison | Number of Women | Arithmetic Average Salary Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Woman rated above male match ..... | 11 | 1.009 |
| Woman and man rated the same ..... | 23 | 0.992 |
| Woman rated below male match ..... | 21 | 0.969 |
| All woman-man pairs ..... | 55 | 0.987 |
| Unweighted average of first three lines ..... | -- | 0.990 |

instances within the first group of eleven pairs in which the salary difference will be larger than 1 percent, but that the difference will sometimes be in favor of the woman, sometimes in favor of the man. And so on, for each group of pairs.)

The average salary difference in the eleven pairs in which the women were rated above their male matches is about 1 percent in favor of women; the corresponding difference in the twenty-one pairs in which men were rated above their female counterparts is about 3 percent in favor of the men. For the twenty-three pairs in which men and women had the same rating, the mean salary difference is about 1 percent in favor of men. Had the pairs been distributed equally among the three rating categories, the mean salary difference would be 1 percent in favor of men. The mean salary difference among all fifty-five pairs was slightly more than 1 percent in favor of men.

These data do not indicate to us that there is a tendency for the salaries received by faculty women to differ substantially from those received by men who are approximately their equals in terms of amount and kind of talent and dedication of their talent to University employment.

The data in Table 3 do not of course establish beyond all doubt that even on the average women on the faculty receive the same financial rewards as their male equals. In the first place, fringe benefits were excluded from analysis and it is conceivable that they averaged substantially less for women. However, this is unlikely, because the fringe benefit formulas are the same for women as for men. Second, the fifty-five women covered in Table 3 are not a random sample from the eighty-one women on the faculty, so that the omission of twenty-six women may lead to error in estimating the average salary difference. We have no way of knowing how serious this shortcoming of the data may be. Third, the comparisons in the table are between persons of the same academic rank, and some may argue that this control for rank may itself introduce bias. The meager data we have regarding promotions of men and women do not, however, support this latter view. Fourth, as mentioned earlier, the findings may have been biased by the ways in which chairmen selected the male matches.

*Salaries of Married Women*

It is sometimes argued that married women are not as mobile in the labor market as single women and that consequently single women will fare better relative to men than will married women. It is of interest in this connection, also, that a few department chairmen commented that in considering salaries, they consider the marital status of a woman, view her salary as a second income, and are therefore less concerned with it than with the salary of a comparable man. While recognizing that some women are themselves content with this approach, the Committee views it as undesirable. It is only fair to state, however, that we did not find evidence that this attitude in fact led to lower salaries for married women. The picture that emerges from Table 3 would not be much altered by introducing marital status as a variable. For example, the arithmetic mean salary ratio for the thirty-four pairs involving married women was 0.975; the corresponding mean for the twenty-one pairs involving single women was 1.005, about 3 percent higher. While this overall picture may be influenced by the fact that matches could not be found for all eighty-one women, the Committee has been intrigued by the possibility that even when certain chairmen express such attitudes about the salaries of married women, they do not necessarily act on those attitudes. If the latter is true, it is another indication of the point made at various places in this report—namely, that attitudes and expectations are not always synonymous with reality, not even on this campus. We hope the present report will help diminish the disparity between the two.

*Women as Teachers and Researchers*

Another of the clichés about women is that they are better teachers than researchers. To see if there were truth in this assertion, we inquired of faculty women as to the allocation of their time to teaching, research, administrative duties, and outside professional activities; and we examined the chairmen's evaluations of women and their male matches. The reports of allocations of time varied widely by area in the University and even inside the same area; no particular pattern emerged. The chairmen's ratings produced the data shown in the two tables that follow.

TABLE 4

Contributions of Faculty Women
(Ratings by Chairmen)

| Activities Compared | Number of Women for Which First Activity Was Rated | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Above the Second | Equal to the second | Below the Second | Total |
| Teaching versus research | 23 | 16 | 14 | 53 |
| Teaching versus administration | 21 | 17 | 7 | 45 |
| Teaching versus outside professional activities | 28 | 12 | 5 | 45 |
| Research versus administration | 18 | 12 | 16 | 46 |
| Research versus outside | 21 | 15 | 9 | 45 |
| Administration versus outside | 18 | 22 | 3 | 43 |

TABLE 5

Comparisons of Women with Their Male Matches
(Ratings by Chairmen)

| Activity | Woman Rated Above Her Male Match | Woman Rated the Same | Woman Rated Below Her Male Match | Total Pairs for Whom Data Were Available |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research | 14 | 16 | 17 | 47 |
| Teaching | 18 | 15 | 15 | 48 |
| Administration | 11 | 21 | 11 | 43 |
| Outside professional activities | 8 | 22 | 14 | 44 |

The data in Table 4 are to be interpreted with caution, for not all chairmen may have had the same standards in mind (some may have weighted amount of activity more than quality of performance), the standards may vary considerably from one field to another, and so on. Nevertheless the data are useful in indicating that there is no one pattern in the contributions faculty women are making--a point that becomes even clearer in Table 5 where each woman is compared to her male match and where both members of the pair have been rated by the same person.

What Table 5 shows is that there are some women who rank higher than men as teachers and some who rank lower, some women who rank higher as researchers and some lower, and a large number who are equal in both respects. The table does not support the cliché, at least so far as women are concerned. Here, as elsewhere, the matter seems to turn on the interests and abilities of the person concerned and, like our other data, these data support the proposition that academics should be thought of as individuals and not as "women academics" or "men academics."

*Part-time Appointments*

We asked chairmen and deans whether they favored part-time appointments for faculty women. The responses varied, with the same number saying yes as saying no; with a few saying yes, but for both men and women; and a few saying yes, but only in special cases. Some pointed out that joint appointments exist in most parts of the University, and if a woman's time is divided jointly with responsibilities in the home rather than with responsibilities in another department, it would not make much difference to the department in question. Those who opposed part-time appointments argued that a faculty member cannot accomplish the necessary research and teaching on a part-time basis. Especially in the physical and biological sciences, the argument was cited that research developments move quickly, the individual's talent must be developed quickly, and to stay in the forefront of one's field requires full-time dedication. (The latter argument, by extension, is often put forth to explain the small number of women in the "hard" sciences, especially in research positions, on grounds that even the most talented women choose to give at least some of their time to the roles of wife and mother and are therefore loath to make the necessary commitment.)

The Committee recognizes with approval the flexibility that exists within the University with regard to part-time appointments. We were pleased to discover, for instance, that tenure has been provided in a few cases where the faculty person has always been on a part-time appointment; just as we discovered that a few full-time tenured persons were maintained on tenure when they found it desirable to move from full-time to part-time.

*We recommend that such flexibilities as we have commented on here and at other points in this report be made better known.*

*Stretch-out to Tenure*

The Committee inquired of chairmen and of both men and women faculty members if

stretch-outs to tenure should be recommended (at the option of the individual). Here again opinions were varied. Some believed that there should be longer periods for full-time assistant professors or that there should be longer first contracts (for example, greater use of initial four-year appointments followed by three-year appointments—an option already provided in the Statutes). Of those who argued against stretch-out to tenure, some said it might lead to exploitation and pointed out that fixed times for promotion decisions had been set by the rules of the American Association of University Professors as well as by national practice, in part to prevent such possible exploitation. Others argued that stretch-out was unnecessary because it can be determined by the end of six or seven years whether or not a colleague is worthy of tenure.

On the whole, however, chairmen, deans, and faculty members felt that the necessary flexibility already exists and that the establishment of additional rules and regulations should be resisted—a position with which the Committee concurs.

*Changing Career Patterns*

Although the division of labor between men and women is changing in our society, cultural expectations still assign heavier responsibility to women for household and child care. More women than men are therefore deterred from full participation in the academic labor force. Appendix D shows that of the men and women teaching in United States universities and four-year colleges in spring 1963, 86 percent of the men but only 31 percent of the women were married with spouse present; 57 percent of the women had never married, and 81 percent had no children.

We suspect the choices reflected by these figures are changing. It may be that the career woman of the 1920s and 1930s who chose not to marry (and who is reflected in fairly high academic participation rates through the 1930s) was replaced by the potential career woman who chose to have a family (reflected in the decline of women in academia from the 1930s through the 1950s), and is being replaced in turn by a new career woman who wishes to combine both options (reflected in the rise of women in academia in the 1960s). While these generational variations do not happen to be reflected in our present group of University of Chicago faculty, this new career pattern developing nationally may present problems not only to the women themselves but also to the institutions in which they participate. These problems are likely to occur with increasing frequency for this University as well as for others. Two immediate phenomena arising from these new career choices for women are the academic tandem team and problems of child care.

*The Tandem Team*

The woman in academia, we anticipate, will increasingly be the tandem woman (attached, that is, to an academic husband). Until such time as male-female career roles are more equalized in the society at large, she may find herself disadvantaged by the lack of geographic mobility and by home responsibilities.

One dimension of this problem was reported by chairmen in recruiting men who have professional wives. The cases are increasing where the acceptance of an academic appointment by a man hinges on a job for his wife. Chairmen themselves have been and presumably will continue

to be the most motivated and talented employment agents in such situations. There is also a small but growing number of cases where a woman is sought and her husband must be accommodated. (The latter instances are probably more frequent than is immediately apparent. They may not materialize as "cases" because chairmen, following a practice unlike the one they follow in the case of a man, may hesitate to offer an appointment to a woman unless a position for her husband is already in prospect.) The subtlety of this practice is well illustrated by one chairman's comment about a prominent woman scholar in his field whom he would like to have on his faculty. He reported that the department had never even considered trying to recruit her because they assumed that her husband, also an academic, would not want to move.

In instances where it is a woman who is wanted, it is not unknown that a chairman has worried about precipitating a family crisis should the husband receive a less satisfactory offer than his wife. We assume that the cultural norms in this connection are in flux. Although chairmen and deans must be responsive to the human needs in each situation, we suggest that the chairman make sure to consult the woman in each such instance, lest he foreclose his recruiting opportunities and lose talent for the University by presuming in advance what the woman's, or her husband's, response will be.

Beyond this, the Committee urges chairmen and deans to put forth the same efforts when it is a married woman who is being recruited as when it is a married man and that chairmen's talents as employment agents for spouses be exercised as vigorously in the one direction as in the other.

*Child Care*

In the study of academic women already referred to (Appendix D) the point is made that the career choices made by married couples usually take into account that wives are relatively better prepared for household and child care than are husbands. This is presumably the result of different socialization for men and women in our society. At the same time many men and women see a broadened range of choices with regard to child care.

It is misleading to discuss problems of child care as problems peculiar to women. Male interest in child care facilities is increasing. We have heard testimony from young faculty men as well as male graduate students that their productivity and teaching schedules are affected by the need to babysit while their wives work or attend classes. (The awareness of this issue perhaps varies by generation. While many chairmen were keenly aware of the problem of recycling middle-aged women for professional roles, an awareness based perhaps on their own wives' positions, younger men were concerned with the problem of child care.) Even for men who do not face this issue within their own families, it arises when they face shortages of secretarial and other workers.

It is for these reasons that most of us applaud the efforts of the Walker Committee regarding a child care center. However, such a center is only one of the alternative forms of child care which would suit different families. There is need for a clearinghouse within the University which would coordinate information about the variety of formal and informal arrangements available in Hyde Park–men as well as women who are available as babysitters, fathers and mothers who

exchange babysitting mornings and afternoons, and persons who take children into their homes on a fee basis. The clearinghouse could also maintain listings of private nurseries in the area, with their costs.

*We recommend that a clearinghouse on child care facilities be established, as either a direct or indirect responsibility of the University, and that it serve the entire University community—students, academic employees, and nonacademic employees.*

*Summary*

In summarizing this section of the report, it must be said that our investigations did not provide evidence supporting the allegation that women faculty are being treated unfairly or differentially as compared to their male counterparts.* Yet despite the apparent relative equality of salaries, reappointments, promotions to tenure, and allocation of duties, and despite the general sense of satisfaction reported by most women faculty, the Committee recognizes a set of attitudes, often more covert than overt, that not all is well. We noted, for example, that while many women regarded their own situations as optimum,* they were quick to assume that the same might not be true for other women. We noted also that almost without exception women faculty applauded the appearance of this Committee and expressed what in another circumstance might be regarded as an unusual degree of interest in our procedures and in our anticipated recommendations.

It was difficult for some women to make their attitudes explicit, and some of their attitudes are difficult for our Committee to explain except as some lingering suspicion of second-class treatment. We do not know whether these attitudes result primarily from the relative nonvisibility of women faculty or from the fact that so few women are to be found in the roles of department chairmen or deans. The issues surrounding the case of Mrs. Marlene Dixon that had begun to draw attention in December 1968 were still unresolved in the minds of a few. One factor that emerged clearly is that most of the faculty on this campus who are women do not know each other. Almost all were pleased to meet other women and were curious about their life histories.With almost all there was immediate understanding that some problems are uniquely those of women, and a sense of supportive communication developed quickly. (These, we believe, were important byproducts of the Committee's functions.)

If disquietude exists among even a small proportion of the faculty, it is itself a matter of disquietude to this Committee. For this reason, among others, *we recommend that a Committee on Women's Affairs be established, one of whose functions would be to provide a source of information and contact among women faculty as well as between women students and women faculty.*

## B. Lecturers and Research Associates

Our special interest in lecturers and research associates in the University stems from the suggestion that because women occupy higher proportions of these positions than of regular faculty positions, this fact is possible evidence of discrimination. Our investigations revealed that women do indeed occupy 27 percent of the lecturer and 24 percent of the research associate positions, as against 7 percent of regular faculty positions. They occupy 57 percent of the lecturer positions in the College. In order to assess the significance of these facts, we have inquired into the

functions and qualifications of lecturers and research associates and the role women play in these positions.

*Numbers and Types of Lecturers*

Lecturers fall roughly into three groups:

1. Persons with career positions outside the University (e.g., curators at the Field Museum, scientists at Argonne, a cartographer at Rand McNally, librarians at the Newberry Library, etc.). Such people give only a part of their time, and most of them receive no salary from the University. They may teach one or more courses or seminars during the year, and they may assist in the direction of research. Such appointments are mutually beneficial. For the University they provide liaison with other institutions as well as special sources of expertise for students and facuty, and for the individuals concerned they provide contact with a research faculty and access to students.

2. People who have full-time administrative or other positions in the University (e.g., deans of students, executive secretaries of departments, music and foreign law librarians, conductor of the University Symphony, etc.) for whom appointments as lecturers provide titular faculty status as well as certain fringe benefits. These persons may advise students but they seldom teach.

3. Persons who are hired to teach and whose primary job commitments are to these positions (e.g., persons who staff general education courses in social sciences and humanities or who teach introductory language courses). Column 2 in Table 6 shows the number and distribution of lecturers in this third category.

Academic rank may be given to lecturers (e.g., Professorial Lecturer, Assistant Professorial Lecturer), even though the University statutes make no specific mention of this fact.[7]

As shown in Table 6, women account for 44 of the 164 lecturers, a higher percentage than their proportion in regular faculty ranks. Men and women are almost even in the third category—those who are employed to teach specific courses. Most of the lecturers in the third category are in the College, and most of the lecturers in the College are women.

While for some, notably those in the first two categories, the position of lecturer at the University represents an opportunity or responsibility added to their main job, for others it represents something less than the larger academic role they would prefer.

[7]Lecturers are mentioned specifically only once in the University statutes: "Members of a Faculty with emeritus status, lecturers, assistants and academic personnel appointed under the provisions of Statute 13(b) who are appointed for at least one year to give service in the College, a Division, or a School may be invited to attend the meetings and take part in the deliberations of its Faculty, but shall not vote" (p. 45, 1965 edition of the *Statutes).*

## TABLE 6

Lecturers in the University: By Academic Unit, Sex, and Category of Appointment (Spring 1969)[a]

| Academic Unit | Lecturers in All Categories (1, 2, 3) | | Lecturers in Category 3 Only | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| *College* | | | | |
| Biology | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Humanities | 11 | 14 | 10 | 13 |
| New Collegiate Division | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Physical Sciences | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Social Sciences | 9 | 11 | 7 | 10 |
| Total | 23 | 27 | 19 | 25 |
| *Divisions* | | | | |
| Biological Sciences | 41 | 3 | 10 | 1 |
| Humanities | 6 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| Physical Sciences | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Social Sciences | 14 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 74 | 10 | 14 | 6 |
| *Professional Schools* | | | | |
| Divinity | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Business | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Education | 6 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Law | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Medicine | (included in Biological Sciences Division) | | | |
| Social Service Administration | 6 | 3 | N/A | N/A |
| Total | 23 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Grand Total | 120 | 44 | 35 | 32 |

[a]Does not include the Industrial Relations Center, the Oriental Institute, or the National Opinion Research Center.

## TABLE 7

Research Associates in the University:
By Academic Unit and Sex (Spring 1969)

| Academic Unit | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| *College* | 0 | 0 |
| *Divisions* | | |
| Biological Sciences | 91 | 30 |
| Humanities | 4 | 2 |
| Physical Sciences | 78 | 6 |
| Social Sciences | 33 | 23 |
| Total | 206 | 61 |
| *Professional Schools* | | |
| Business | 10 | 1 |
| Divinity | 2 | 0 |
| Education | 1 | 3 |
| Law | 1 | 0 |
| Library | 2 | 3 |
| Medicine | (included in Biological Sciences Division) | |
| Social Service Administration | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 17 | 8 |
| Grand Total | 223 | 69 |

*Numbers of Research Associates*

Of the 292 research associates in the University in spring 1969, 69 were women (see Table 7). Research associates also vary widely, and they are more difficult to categorize than lecturers. They are attached mainly to the graduate departments. Like lecturers, research associates may be given academic rank, as in this instance provided in the statutes.[8]

Ninety-two percent of all research associates hold appointments in the divisions, 98 percent of these in the Biological, Physical, and Social Sciences. Research associates in Biological Sciences, who account for 45 percent of the total, are generally on full-time, post-doctoral appointments. They are attached to a particular project and are paid from special project funds. They may move from one project to another, and there is no fixed or conventional limit on the number of times they may be reappointed. Research associates in the Physical Sciences, accounting for 31 percent of the total, are for the most part also full-time, post-doctoral. In both Biological and Physical Sciences, a research associateship is generally looked upon as an interim step between the Ph.D. and a career position in a university. The length of appointment is usually two years, although some may be longer. Twenty-one percent of all research associates hold appointments in Social Sciences, where they are generally attached to specific projects and paid from project funds. Appointments are usually for one year and are renewable, although some are made initially for the full term of the project.

*Satisfactions and Dissatisfactions*

Evaluation of research associate appointments for women is greatly complicated by the fact that the category encompasses a considerable range of salary, status, and responsibility. For some post-Ph.D.s it represents advanced professional training; for others, the opportunity to pursue one's research interests, free from unwanted teaching responsibilities. For some it means working at a routine job in a project where one has only marginal control, and for still others it represents invidious para-academic employment in a context where the norm is to hold a position involving both research and teaching.

Because in the time available to us we could not also interview male research associates, we cannot say whether these various meanings are similarly distributed between the sexes; whether women regard these positions as providing more or less opportunity than do men; or whether these positions represent a transitional or permanent role for men in the same proportions as for women. It is sometimes asserted that men utilize these positions to establish a record of publications and

[8]Research associates are included in Statute 13(b), Other Academic Personnel: "Research Associates are classified as follows: Research Associate (Professor), Research Associate (Associate Professor), Research Associate (Assistant Professor), and Research Associate. The normal period of appointment of Research Associates shall be one year, and reappointments may be made without limitation as to number of reappointments in any rank. Connection with the University ceases at the end of appointment unless reappointment is provided" (p. 43, 1965 edition).

regard them as stepping-stones to more advantageous academic posts, whereas women more often regard them as dead-end jobs; but we have no evidence one way or another.

To further our understanding of women in both lecturer and research associate categories, we interviewed or received letters from twenty-seven of the forty-four women lecturers and forty-three of the sixty-nine women research associates. We also inquired at some length about both groups in interviewing forty-six chairmen and deans. Of the sixty-one women for whom data were available, fifty were married and nineteen of them had young children at home. Thirty-seven were presently working full-time; nineteen held titles that included academic rank.

We analyzed the responses to questions concerning the opportunities in the University for women lecturers and women research associates—responses based on both personal experience and perceptions of the experience of others. Each interview was rated on a scale from 1 to 3: 1) mild or no complaint; 2) moderate or more pronounced sense of discomfort; 3) strong complaint. Of the fifty-eight lecturers and research associates interviewed, which comprise about half the women with these titles, forty-one fell in the category of mild or no complaint; nine in the middle; and five fell in the category of strong complaint. These results suggest that most occupants of these positions do not perceive the opportunity structure as unjust, either to themselves or to others.

There are some interesting differences in the interview responses by division, age, and length of time in the position. Those in Humanities expressed the least discontent, those in Social Sciences the most; the younger women expressed more discontent than the older. (Of ten interviews with language instructors in the College and the Humanities Division, nine declared themselves content. The four lecturers with moderate or strong complaints were all social scientists in the College. With one exception, the lecturers whom we interviewed in the Physical and Biological Sciences and in the professional schools declared themselves content.) Among the research associates a somewhat similar pattern emerges. Of the fourteen interviewed in Social Sciences, three had strong complaints, three moderate, and six none; while three said "don't know." Of the fourteen interviewed in Biological Sciences, twelve declared themselves content; and all the four chemists and three Library School interviewees said the same.

Examination of complaints made by research associates and lecturers according to length of time employed at The University of Chicago suggests that those who had been employed for less than a year tended to perceive their positions as satisfactory; the same was true for those employed for five years or more; but those who had been employed from one to four years were more likely to comment on the undesirable aspects of their positions.

It is difficult to know what these responses measure. It may be that the differences between the social scientists and all the others are indications of levels of ideological awareness as much as they are indicators of differences in objective work situations. That older women are more likely than the young to report their situations as satisfactory may relate to various factors: that one becomes reconciled and stops complaining about one's lot; that when these older women were young they were educated to more modest expectations than today's young women; or that

the older women are more often in jobs that are advantageous, given their talents, interests, and qualifications.*

The number of women with a strong or even moderate sense of grievance is small; yet some convey discontents which, while not sex-specific, should be noted here. Some felt lack of contact with members of their respective departments. A few lecturers expressed concern that they could not properly advise students because they did not receive faculty memoranda, were rarely invited to faculty meetings, were insufficiently attuned to the informal culture of their department. They missed collegial relations with their disciplinary fellows. We suggest that some of these grievances might be alleviated if chairmen and deans would state in writing the precise terms of the appointment as regards not only salary but also duties and privileges; if, at each appointment or reappointment, the question were reviewed of providing a title indicating academic rank; if departmental notices were sent to all lecturers and research associates to keep them informed of departmental policies and activities; and if their attendance at faculty meetings were invited on all appropriate occasions.

### *Why Are So Many Women in These Positions?*

Below we comment briefly on four "explanations" that were presented to us at various times to account for the fact that women constitute a higher percentage of lecturers and research associates than of regular teaching faculty. The explanations, presented below, are loosely worded and contain concealed assumptions, but that is the way they came to us.

*1. Women are more often lecturers or research associates because they do not have the qualifications to fill regular faculty positions.*

Such incomplete data as we have suggest that about 35 percent of the research associate women and about 60 percent of the lecturer women do not possess the Ph.D. (For research associates we have such information for thirty-one out of the sixty-nine; for lecturers, all in the College, twenty-five out of the forty-four.) We do not have similar data for men who are research associates or lecturers or for the regular teaching faculty, either men or women. The present data of course. are inconclusive.

*2. Many women research associates and lecturers are married and hence represent a "captive labor force" of persons who cannot bargain effectively for other positions.*

Of the women research associates and lecturers whom we interviewed, 82 percent are married, two-fifths of these to faculty men. At the same time, 60 percent of the regular teaching faculty who are women are married, one-third of these to faculty men. Among the faculty women the proportions who are married are roughly the same at the successive academic ranks, a fact which tends to run counter to the explanation.

*3. Women are research associates and lecturers because these positions are the best that a male-dominant society will allow them.*

Our interviews with department chairmen elicited opinions which bear upon this statement only very indirectly. We encountered one chairman who believed that women's physiological nature, as he put it, was a restraint on their potential. We found another who believed women do not succeed in top administrative positions because they become too emotionally involved and are thus unable to make difficult decisions. However, these are but two among the forty-six deans and chairmen we interviewed. While we assume that interviews by a Committee on University Women are not likely to elicit negative feelings about women's professional roles, we would be hard put to make a case for overt discriminatory attitudes among male faculty on the basis of the evidence before us.

Some of the evidence is necessarily equivocal. In the case of a chairman who says that he will pay a married woman less because she is geographically captive, is he being motivated by economic factors in managing his departmental budget or by his perception of women? When a chairman tells us, as many did, that household and children might prevent a woman's full career commitment, is he perceiving a social fact, or is he articulating an ideology which leads him to encourage women to take non-ladder positions?

To the extent to which judgments about the positions of research associates and lecturers are formed from notions about discrimination, other data gathered by the Committee with respect to students and faculty are relevant, and we refer the reader to other parts of this report.

*4. Women otherwise qualified for regular faculty positions are lecturers and research associates because they find these positions more convenient than positions on the academic ladder.*

Our interviews suggest that some women find these positions convenient precisely because they are short term or because they are psychologically or professionally less demanding than positions on the ladder. The finding that many women welcome such fringe roles for a short or long portion of their work lives is subject to various interpretations. It has been suggested that this alleged *sense of convenience may be the "false consciousness" of an oppressed class of women who have* accepted the ideology of dominant males and who therefore give socially acceptable responses in interviews.[9] The caucus of graduate sociology women, for instance, urged this view upon us, suggesting that any inferences drawn from interviews with research associates and lecturers are meaningless. While it is at best a difficult social science problem to distinguish real from false consciousness, we are prepared to credit the notion that some academic women have learned to underestimate their own potential and the opportunities open to them. These attitudes depend partly on the effects of earlier socialization-effects which it is difficult for the University to change in any but an indirect fashion. However, to rest our case heavily on the idea of false consciousness would be to credit the interpretations of some of our radical women colleagues more than those of our interviewees. We must also credit the notion that the claimed convenience may be the real self-estimate, the true consciousness of a woman who has opted to retain responsibility for her house and children as a

[9]The interviews with lecturers and research associates were carried out by two women staff members employed for the purpose, both experienced interviewers, one a lecturer and the other a Ph.D. student. In all instances, the interviewee was invited to speak, if she preferred, with a member of the Committee.

desired vocation rather than as a reluctantly assumed necessity, a responsibility which she wishes to combine with a more casual commitment to academia. For such women, the availability of positions as lecturers and research associates offers some of that very flexibility which we are eager to maintain in the University.

*Summary*

We see, then, a dual potential in lecturer and research associate positions and in the flexibility which they represent. This flexibility in the hands of an unaware chairman or an unaware woman may become an occasion for exploitation and self-exploitation.* For these problems, our suggestions lie as much in the realm of self-consciousness as of institutional remedies. In the introduction to this report, we suggested that perhaps some of the problems faced by women might be alleviated if women exercised more self-consciousness in making their choices. This is one such place where more intelligent and aware actions are required. We would hope, for example, that department chairmen and other senior colleagues would encourage able young women to convert a job orientation into a career orientation just as they encourage male junior colleagues. More formally we suggest that department chairmen be asked to hold conversations every year with the lecturer or research associate for exchange of information regarding the plans, expectations, and grievances of each.

Although it is perhaps beyond the terms of reference of this Committee, we would like to call to the attention of the faculties certain problems with the position of lecturer. We have noticed the wide range of characteristics of those occupying lectureships. Certainly the variation and flexibility of such appointments is of great advantage to the University, enabling it to employ many excellent individuals who might otherwise be unavailable. This extreme flexibility, however, also carries with it some inherent danger that situations which have the appearance of discrimination may develop. This potentiality is particularly troublesome in an age in which there is an increasing disposition to view the world in terms of self-conscious social categories. Some attention to this issue may prevent that which is potential from becoming actual.

Our Committee was disturbed by the fact that the University statutes do not, except by indirection, even provide for the position of lecturer, nor are lecturers apparently considered as members of the faculty on the one hand or as other academic personnel on the other. Some chairmen and deans indicated they were aware of difficulties with the lecturer position and would welcome a general consideration of the problem.

The Committee does not offer any specific recommendation, but we believe that some review of the *functions* fulfilled by lecturers in each academic unit should be conducted by the appropriate faculties at regular intervals, perhaps every three years. This review should be in addition to the annual interviews with individual lecturers which are suggested above.

We are reluctant to recommend more than this with regard to both research associates and lecturers, lest more rigorous institutional procedures deprive these positions of their flexibility and of the positive opportunities which they represent for women. These positive opportunities arise because these positions often (but not always) require less career commitment than do regular ladder positions and therefore lend themselves to the special life style or life cycle needs of some women.

# II. STUDENT WOMEN

## A. Background Data

The University of Chicago from its beginning has welcomed women students at both undergraduate and graduate levels. The general questions before us now are these: Do men and women students receive equitable treatment with respect to admissions, financial assistance, encouragement, and support? Do special problems exist for women students on this campus; and if so, what actions can the University take to alleviate such problems?

### *Trends in Total Enrollment*

Data obtained from the Registrar's Office regarding total enrollment in the College, the divisions, and the professional schools since 1939 are presented in Table 8. The overall trends indicate a moderately high enrollment of women in the prewar period followed by a very high proportion during the war years, then a sharp drop in 1946 with the return of veterans. The proportion of women increased slowly in the decade following the war and then more rapidly since the middle 1950s. The differences over time are more marked in the divisions and professional schools than in the College.

These data are gross aggregates and cannot be easily interpreted. On the one hand they mask a complex set of factors involving the differential growth of various units in the University (e.g., the growth of the School of Business, the disappearance of departments of Home Economics and Nursing Education). On the other hand they reflect, presumably, a broader set of social factors relating to the changing motivations and changing patterns of social support for women who pursue higher education. Thus the data are presented here primarily to provide a historical context for some of the questions before us.

### *Degrees Granted*

Another set of contextual data in Table 9 show the number of men and women who received academic degrees in 1968-69.

## TABLE 8

### Total Enrollment Data

| Year | College | | Divisions | | Professional Schools | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Enrollment | Percent Women | Total Enrollment | Percent Women | Total Enrollment | Percent Women |
| 1939-40 | 1,643 | 37% | 2,507 | 35% | 1,580 | 42% |
| 40-41 | 1,593 | 40 | 2,628 | 32 | 1,566 | 41 |
| 41-42 | 1,521 | 44 | 2,385 | 36 | 1,409 | 39 |
| 42-43 | 1,747 | 43 | 2,066 | 40 | 1,126 | 46 |
| 43-44 | 1,341 | 60 | 1,275 | 61 | 899 | 59 |
| 1944-45 | 1,982 | 61 | 1,444 | 66 | 985 | 60 |
| 45-46 | 2,214 | 54 | 1,659 | 57 | 1,033 | 55 |
| 46-47 | 2,752 | 28 | 3,885 | 28 | 1,779 | 26 |
| 47-48 | 2,947 | 29 | 3,880 | 23 | 1,737 | 26 |
| 48-49 | 2,572 | 29 | 3,993 | 22 | 1,645 | 23 |
| 1949-50 | 2,354 | 29 | 3,782 | 21 | 1,489 | 18 |
| 50-51 | 1,862 | 31 | 3,441 | 21 | 1,515 | 21 |
| 51-52 | 1,601 | 30 | 3,025 | 21 | 1,382 | 19 |
| 52-53 | 1,351 | 30 | 2,487 | 22 | 1,226 | 19 |
| 53-54 | 1,168 | 30 | 2,300 | 23 | 1,174 | 20 |
| 1954-55 | 1,350 | 32 | 2,170 | 25 | 1,244 | 16 |
| 55-56 | 1,645 | 31 | 2,180 | 25 | 1,265 | 17 |
| 56-57 | 1,977 | 35 | 2,109 | 27 | 1,243 | 15 |
| 57-58 | 2,183 | 36 | 2,299 | 25 | 1,303 | 16 |
| 58-59 | 2,136 | 35 | 2,447 | 24[a] | 1,219 | 18 |
| 1959-60 | 2,119 | 36 | 2,419 | 22[a] | 1,289 | 18 |
| 60-61 | 2,018 | 36 | 2,374 | 21[a] | 1,234 | 18 |
| 1961-65 | (figures not available) | | | | | |
| 1965-66 | 2,321 | 37 | 2,971 | 27 | 2,086 | 23 |
| 66-67 | 2,485 | 39 | 3,199 | 27 | 2,210 | 23 |
| 67-68 | 2,470 | 41 | 3,147 | 28 | 2,222 | 25 |
| 68-69 | 2,598 | 39 | 3,553 | 28 | 2,184 | 28 |

[a] Medical students included.

## TABLE 9

### Academic Degrees Awarded, 1968-69

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| B.A. | 287 | 184 |
| M.A., M.S. | | |
| Biological Sciences | 11 | 7 |
| Humanities | 113 | 101 |
| Physical Sciences | 81 | 9 |
| Social Sciences | 174 | 95 |
| Ph.D. | | |
| Biological Sciences | 48 | 6 |
| Humanities | 33 | 11 |
| Physical Sciences | 63 | 7 |
| Social Sciences | 98 | 25 |
| Divinity School | | |
| B.D. | 2 | 0 |
| M.A. and M.Th. | 55 | 6 |
| Ph.D. | 18 | 0 |
| D.Min. | 7 | 1 |
| Graduate School of Business | | |
| M.B.A. | 480 | 15 |
| Ph.D. | 8 | 0 |
| Graduate School of Education | | |
| M.A.T. | 25 | 47 |
| M.S.T. | 1 | 18 |
| Law School | | |
| J.D. | 133 | 8 |
| M.Comp.L. | 6 | 0 |
| D.Comp.L. | 3 | 0 |
| Graduate Library School | | |
| M.A. | 16 | 17 |
| Ph.D. | 1 | 0 |
| Pritzker School of Medicine | | |
| M.D. | 53 | 9 |
| Social Service Administration | | |
| M.A. | 50 | 118 |
| Ph.D. | 9 | 6 |

In the sections to follow, we focus attention on the immediate past and present and on what we regard as the most important decision-making levels in the University—namely, individual departments and schools.

## B. Admissions and Aid

The procedures involved in admissions and aid are more complex than need be described here, and they vary somewhat from one part of the University to the next. For the most part the individual department or school has almost complete autonomy with regard to the students it will admit and a considerable degree of autonomy with regard to the students who will receive financial aid. (Each department within a division does not determine the amount of funds at its disposal, but it ranks its own students to whom aid should be given.)

For this reason we have arrayed the data on admissions and aid by individual department and school. The data are not as complete as we would like. In some academic units records are not kept in a manner that permits interdepartmental comparison; and in others, retrieval of information would have been more difficult or more costly than we felt warranted.

We have viewed the admissions and aid process as a sequential one, beginning with the student's application to the University, followed by the decision on admission; the decision regarding financial aid for those who were both admitted and had applied for aid; offers of admission (with aid or without); and finally, the applicant's decision to accept the offer. Beginning with the application step, we have looked separately at the probabilities for men and women of moving on to the next step in the process.

Data on admissions and aid for 1967, 1968, and 1969 have been obtained from the Office of Admissions.[10] Table 10 presents the data for admissions;[11] Table 11, the data regarding financial aid for those students for whom the prior decision regarding admission had been favorable.

[10]The data were obtained in early August 1969 and do not include applications processed thereafter. Excluded from analysis for all three years were applications for admission in academic quarters other than the autumn and applications for student-at-large status (not degree candidates).

[11]Column E in Table 10, furthermore, is based not on the actual enrollment figures in the successive autumn quarters but on the number who had indicated they would enter. Insofar as some students accept admission-aid offers but then do not actually matriculate, these figures may be somewhat different from autumn enrollment figures.

## TABLE 10

### Admissions for 1967, 1968, 1969 (3-Year Averages)

| Academic Unit | (A) Number of Applicants | (B) Percent of Applicants Who Are Women | (C) Percent of Applicants Who Are Accepted | | (D) Percent of Those Accepted Who Enter | | (E) Percent of Entrants Who Are Women[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Men | Women | Men | Women | |
| *College* | 2,010 | 40% | 61% | 63% | 51% | 54% | 41% |
| *Physical Sciences* | | | | | | | |
| Astronomy | 34 | 10 | 62 | 40 | 29 | 50 | 11 |
| Chemistry | 203 | 19 | 59 | 60 | 35 | 35 | 19 |
| Geophysical Sciences | 35 | 7 | 77 | 86 | 57 | 33 | 4 |
| Information Sciences | 47 | 22 | 61 | 84 | 66 | 65 | 27 |
| Mathematics | 211 | 13 | 41 | 20 | 31 | 53 | 11 |
| Physics | 216 | 6 | 70 | 51 | 30 | 19 | 3 |
| Statistics | 43 | 17 | 42 | 59 | 44 | 38 | 20 |
| *Biological Sciences* | | | | | | | |
| Anatomy | 15 | 13 | 43 | 75 | 81 | 67 | 24 |
| Biochemistry | 46 | 32 | 51 | 52 | 38 | 46 | 38 |
| Biology, Evolutionary Biology, Genetics, Mathematical Biology | 87 | 32 | 50 | 56 | 48 | 47 | 34 |
| Biophysics | 28 | 14 | 61 | 58 | 37 | 43 | 16 |
| Microbiology | 35 | 44 | 31 | 41 | 50 | 44 | 47 |
| Pharmacology | 17 | 26 | 54 | 92 | 40 | 75 | 53 |
| Physiology | 15 | 26 | 26 | 50 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| *Professional Schools*[b] | | | | | | | |
| Law | 1,410 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 17 |
| Medicine | 1,320 | 9 | 14 | 11 | 44 | 65 | 10 |
| Social Service Administration[c] | 607 | 67 | 50 | 58 | 63 | 57 | 68 |
| Education[d] | 330 | 77 | 24 | 76 | 20 | 80 | 85 |
| Library[e] | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 69 |
| Business | 1,251 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 4 |

TABLE 10—Continued

| Academic Unit | (A) Number of Applicants | (B) Percent of Applicants Who Are Women | (C) Percent of Applicants Who Are Accepted Men | (C) Women | (D) Percent of Those Accepted Who Enter Men | (D) Women | (E) Percent of Entrants Who Are Women[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Social Sciences* | | | | | | | |
| Anthropology | 204 | 43% | 41% | 36% | 35% | 40% | 44% |
| Divisional M.A. | 25 | 28 | 87 | 81 | 54 | 53 | 26 |
| Economics | 327 | 10 | 52 | 49 | 32 | 25 | 8 |
| Education | 219 | 47 | 70 | 61 | 46 | 49 | 45 |
| Geography | 55 | 19 | 76 | 66 | 34 | 33 | 17 |
| History | 346 | 28 | 61 | 62 | 30 | 29 | 28 |
| Human Development | 116 | 51 | 27 | 29 | 43 | 49 | 56 |
| International Relations | 45 | 17 | 66 | 70 | 39 | 20 | 14 |
| Political Science | 410 | 21 | 41 | 48 | 29 | 41 | 30 |
| Psychology | 287 | 37 | 24 | 26 | 31 | 40 | 45 |
| Social Thought | 42 | 19 | 21 | 8 | 68 | 0 | 0 |
| Sociology | 322 | 36 | 34 | 31 | 36 | 46 | 40 |
| *Humanities* | | | | | | | |
| Art | 107 | 63 | 56 | 61 | 42 | 43 | 65 |
| Classical Languages and Literatures | 38 | 48 | 71 | 84 | 21 | 26 | 57 |
| Comparative Literature | 39 | 56 | 73 | 68 | 16 | 20 | 60 |
| English | 479 | 46 | 67 | 71 | 26 | 29 | 49 |
| Far Eastern Languages and Civilizations | 55 | 33 | 48 | 61 | 34 | 47 | 45 |
| General Studies | 40 | 55 | 56 | 67 | 53 | 57 | 61 |
| Germanic Languages and Literatures | 44 | 56 | 90 | 91 | 31 | 42 | 64 |
| History | 107 | 27 | 60 | 67 | 23 | 29 | 35 |
| History of Culture | 26 | 24 | 55 | 47 | 64 | 44 | 16 |
| Linguistics | 59 | 41 | 74 | 81 | 32 | 38 | 47 |
| Music | 28 | 39 | 75 | 62 | 47 | 33 | 28 |
| Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations | 58 | 32 | 66 | 79 | 37 | 39 | 37 |
| Philosophy | 155 | 20 | 44 | 47 | 22 | 35 | 29 |
| Slavic Languages and Literatures | 59 | 38 | 74 | 72 | 32 | 24 | 32 |
| Romance Languages and Literatures | 98 | 65 | 76 | 75 | 27 | 32 | 68 |
| South Asian Languages and Civilizations | 19 | 48 | 77 | 71 | 44 | 30 | 37 |

[a] Entrants are those who indicate that they will enter in the autumn.
[b] Data not available for Divinity School.
[c] Data refer only to 1967, 1968.
[d] Data refer only to 1969.
[e] Number of students admitted averaged 41; other data not available.

If we look first at the outcome of the admissions procedures and consider the data in Column E of Table 10, striking variation is apparent in different parts of the University with regard to the proportion of entering students who are women. The proportion is relatively high in the Humanities and in the behavioral science departments of the Social Sciences and low in the Physical Sciences; but there is also marked variation among departments within the same division. In the professional schools, the proportions are high in Education and Social Service Administration; low in Law, Medicine, and Business.

Given the particular departments and schools that constitute The University of Chicago, this overall distribution of women students is similar to that for the country at large. It probably reflects the wide variations that are presently perceived to exist in both the opportunities and the difficulties encountered by women in different academic and professional fields in the United States today. The compelling question that arises nonetheless is why, in a University which is otherwise in a position of leadership among educational institutions, should this distribution merely reflect the national pattern? In more specific terms, why is it that so few women students enter the physical sciences, law, business, and medicine at The University of Chicago?

*Proportions Admitted Who Are Women*

Looking now at the sequential process of admission, the data in Column B of Table 10 show the fraction of all applicants who are women. The fraction varies enormously among the departments and schools, ranging from 6 percent in Physics to 77 percent in the Graduate School of Education. Although the differences among departments are large, they are not surprising. The distribution of *applicants* by sex among various fields of study corresponds fairly closely to the distribution of *entrants* by sex.

Column C of Table 10 shows separately by sex the fraction of applicants accepted for admission. In twenty-eight of the forty-six academic units the fraction of applicants admitted was larger for women than for men, even though the difference in many instances was slight. Furthermore the weighted average of the differences (women minus men) in admission fractions in Column C, with weights based on Column A, was about two percentage points. However, if the Graduate School of Education is not included, this weighted average falls to one-sixth of a percentage point. Thus there was at most a small overall difference in favor of women.

*Academic Abilities of Men and Women*

The latter fact does not, of course, settle the question regarding differential admission policies for men and women in the University. It is possible, as sometimes alleged, that women applicants have higher academic potential than men and that in the absence of differential treatment they would be admitted in greater proportions. The Committee was unable to undertake a study of the relative qualifications of men and women applicants in various parts of the University, given the resources at our disposal, but we have one set of relevant data regarding applicants to the College for 1969 that is shown in Table 11. It should be noted that admission procedures in the College are not necessarily representative of other parts of the University and that the College is one of the

academic units with the highest proportion of women.

Part I of Table 11 shows that among both applicants and matriculants the fraction of men rated in the top category (#1) by the College admissions staff was markedly higher than the corresponding fraction for women. Furthermore, the fraction of men rated in the bottom category was lower than the corresponding fraction for women, although here the difference was not large. (Of course it may be argued that in their ratings the College admissions staff was prejudiced against women.)

Part II of Table 11 shows that on the Scholastic Aptitude Test in mathematics, men applicants and matriculants performed markedly better than women applicants and matriculants. In the verbal scores, on the other hand, the women performed better than the men, although the differences were not as large as the differences in the other direction that appeared on the mathematics scores.

Thus the data for the College in Column C of Table 10 and in Table 11, although obviously incomplete, would suggest that if admission policies are operating differentially, the difference is in favor of women rather than men. Yet the interpretation to be drawn from these data for the College is unclear for reasons other than that the data are incomplete. For one thing the College admissions staff, in making its ratings of an applicant, has before it information of various types; and it is not known how much weight is given to SAT scores as compared, say, with course grades earned in high school where, judging from national data, women on the average do better than men. Neither is it clear how much significance should be attached to differences in SAT scores as predictors of performance in the College, especially when it is not known which of the collegiate divisions the student will choose and when it is not known what a high score in mathematics may mean, say, for the student who will major in a field in humanities.

We have no systematic data comparable to those in Table 11 for graduate students. (It might have been possible, for at least some departments, to compare scores for men and women on the Graduate Record Examination, but we decided against doing so, given the experience of several members of the Committee that GRE scores are poor predictors of academic performance in graduate units where, as is often the case at this University, applicants are relatively homogeneous on the GRE.) Of the graduate women who responded to the student questionnaire 34 percent reported grade point averages of A or A–; the corresponding proportion for the men respondents was 27 percent (see question 16 in Appendix E). It is hard to know how seriously to take these figures, because they are self-reported and because grading practices differ from one academic unit to another. Indeed, at least one academic unit does not use a letter grading system.

Unfortunately, lacking systematic data, the Committee is unable to say more on the question of possible differences between men and women applicants as regards academic ability.

Returning now to Table 10, Column D, among admitted applicants there is a slight tendency for women in greater proportion than men to accept the admission offer. Thus, since women applicants are admitted in slightly higher ratios than men and accept admission in slightly higher ratios, there is a small tendency for women applicants to enter in greater proportion than

TABLE 11

Academic Abilities of Applicants and Matriculants in the College, 1969[a]

| | Academic Abilities | Ratios of Men to Women | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | All Applicants | Matriculants |
| I. | Admission rating (based on all available information): | | |
| | Rated 1 (highest) | 2.5 | 2.85 |
| | 2 | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| | 3 | 1.7 | 1.4 |
| | 4 | 1.2 | 1.4 |
| | Total group | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| II. | Scholastic Aptitude Test scores: | Verbal / Math | Verbal / Math |
| | 750-800 | 1.4 / 5.5 | 1.4 / 5.7 |
| | 700-749 | 1.8 / 3.1 | 1.5 / 2.7 |
| | 650-699 | 1.7 / 1.8 | 1.2 / 1.3 |
| | 600-649 | 1.7 / 2.3 | 1.7 / 0.8 |
| | 550-599 | 1.8 / 1.0 | |
| | 500-549 | 2.1 / 0.8 | |

[a] The table is to be read as follows: Among applicants, two and one-half times as many men as women were rated 1 (highest); one and one-half times as many men as women were rated 2; and so on, producing the ratios shown in Column A. Among matriculants (those who actually enter), the ratios are somewhat different, as shown in Column B.

men (compare Columns B and E in Table 10). Nevertheless, the differences among academic units in the proportion of their entrants who are women are accounted for mainly by the differences in the proportions of their applicants who are women, rather than by differences in admission policies.

The evidence we have been able to gather, therefore, suggests that an increase in the number of women applicants would result, other things being equal, in a proportionate increase in women matriculants.

*Recruitment Efforts*

As part of our investigation we inquired about procedures for recruiting students into the various academic units. The Committee was disturbed to discover that, with a few notable exceptions, departments make little effort to recruit talented students of either sex. Some departments make no effort at the initial stage, but once offers of admission have gone out make vigorous efforts to encourage those admitted to accept the offer. This is especially true for the "top" students who are offered the most attractive fellowships and traineeships; and some departments compete actively with other universities for such students.

The Committee believes that in various parts of the University vigorous efforts to recruit qualified students would significantly improve the quality of the student body. As part of such increased efforts we urge departments to give particular attention to procedures which might tap hithertofore neglected sources of talented women. We also urge departments to examine their current application and admission procedures to make sure they are not unwittingly discouraging qualified women from applying.

It is true that active recruitment efforts by the traditionally "male" professional schools in this University (such as medicine, business, and law) have met with only modest success in recruiting women applicants. This leads us to suspect that recruitment efforts along present lines, even though more energetically pursued, will not produce dramatic changes so far as the ratio of men to women students is concerned--not, at least, in the immediate future. If in general the potentials of women are to be better utilized, what is needed are not only more innovative approaches to recruitment, but even more important, better career counseling at the high school and college levels to help young women recognize the wide range of opportunities that are in truth present for women. Thus, while the Committee believes that better recruitment procedures will enable some departments to improve the quality of the overall applicant pool from which both men and women students are drawn, efforts of a more innovative type will be required if more individuals are to be attracted from among the pool of able women. Because the issues involved will vary from one field to the next, the Committee refers this problem to the individual departments and schools.

An additional comment may be in order for those departments where little attention has been given to recruitment. Once students have been notified of admission, a prompt follow-up or a special letter of welcome may sometimes swing the balance for the student, man or woman, who is wavering between The University of Chicago and another university. Such follow-up may be particularly beneficial

in the case of women. The Committee's attention has been drawn, for example, to one professional school at this University where a letter of information and welcome to women admittees signed by other women students seems to have been effective.

*Financial Aid*

The data that the Committee was able to gather on financial aid to men and women students are shown in Table 12. The table covers only the number of offers of fellowships and scholarships made by the University at the time of the admission decision to new graduate students in the four divisions. (In the College, in the M.B.A. program in the Graduate School of Business, and in the Law School, aid is given mainly on the basis of financial need; and data similar to those in the table were not available for the other professional schools.)

Column A of Table 12 shows the number (three-year average) of men and women applicants for aid who had previously been given a favorable decision on admission. Column B shows, for men and women separately, the fraction of these aid applicants to whom aid was offered. In many of the departments the number applying for aid was so small that little statistical significance attaches to the differences for those departments between the figures for men and women shown in Column B. Nevertheless, the overall pattern that emerges from Column B is one in which women somewhat less frequently than men were offered aid. In twenty-four of the forty-two departments covered by the table the fraction of women applicants offered aid was less than the corresponding fraction for men. Furthermore, the weighted average of the differences (men minus women) in the fractions in Column B was about 2.5 percentage points, or about 7 percent of the fraction of women applicants offered aid. (The weights used in computing this average were the total number of aid applicants.)

These data do not establish conclusively that there is a tendency in the graduate departments to give preferential treatment to men in the awarding of fellowships and scholarships. Some departments undoubtedly give preference to students who declare themselves to be Ph.D. candidates over those who declare for the master's degree, and the fraction of women declaring for the master's may be higher than the corresponding fraction for men. Also the data in the table do not control for the quality of the applicant. Even more important, the data deal only with numbers of persons offered aid rather than with amount of aid offered, and no consideration is given to aid (including research assistantships) offered to students after their entry into the University.

Because data of these more meaningful types are lacking, the Committee cannot assess the degree to which women may or may not be differentially treated over all with regard to financial aid. Although we inquired of all departments, we were unhappily impressed with the extent to which departmental records were lacking.

We did query departments regarding their aid policies, and most of them reported that they allocate financial aid strictly on the basis of merit. A few, however, state the judgment that women are less likely than men to complete the Ph.D. (in this connection, see Table 9 and the section of

TABLE 12

For Students Who Were Accepted:
Financial Aid Data for 1967, 1968, 1969 (3-Year Averages)

| Academic Unit | (A) Number Who Applied for Aid | | (B) Percent of Column A Who Were Offered Aid | | (C) Percent of Column B Who Entered | | (D) Percent of Those Not Offered Aid Who Entered | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| *Physical Sciences*[a] | | | | | | | | |
| Astronomy | 19 | 1 | 72% | 100% | 35% | 50% | 12% | 0% |
| Chemistry | 97 | 22 | 91 | 87 | 36 | 36 | 42 | 22 |
| Geophysical Sciences | 24 | 1 | 90 | 100 | 58 | 0 | 43 | 0 |
| Information Sciences | 13 | 7 | 76 | 70 | 55 | 67 | 44 | 40 |
| Mathematics | 63 | 6 | 52 | 71 | 41 | 58 | 23 | 40 |
| Physics | 130 | 6 | 82 | 67 | 34 | 17 | 21 | 17 |
| Statistics | 13 | 4 | 80 | 77 | 52 | 40 | 25 | 33 |
| *Biological Sciences* | | | | | | | | |
| Anatomy | 5 | 2 | 94 | 100 | 87 | 60 | 0 | 0 |
| Biochemistry | 16 | 8 | 74 | 88 | 37 | 52 | 42 | 0 |
| Biology, Evolutionary Bioiogy, Genetics, Mathematical Biology | 26 | 14 | 86 | 64 | 58 | 59 | 0 | 53 |
| Biophysics | 14 | 2 | 93 | 100 | 35 | 50 | 67 | 0 |
| Microbiology | 5 | 6 | 100 | 67 | 57 | 50 | 0 | 17 |
| Pharmacology | 6 | 3 | 59 | 100 | 40 | 80 | 29 | 0 |
| Physiology | 2 | 2 | 83 | 67 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Social Sciences* | | | | | | | | |
| Anthropology | 41 | 30 | 39 | 35 | 52 | 58 | 27 | 31 |
| Divisional M.A. | 7 | 3 | 45 | 78 | 67 | 57 | 27 | 50 |
| Economics | 123 | 13 | 35 | 21 | 40 | 12 | 20 | 19 |
| Education | 62 | 48 | 27 | 34 | 59 | 61 | 46 | 43 |
| Geography | 27 | 6 | 28 | 32 | 61 | 50 | 22 | 23 |
| History | 128 | 52 | 22 | 21 | 36 | 44 | 26 | 23 |
| Human Development | 13 | 15 | 85 | 65 | 38 | 50 | 67 | 37 |
| International Relations | 21 | 5 | 39 | 20 | 42 | 0 | 18 | 25 |
| Political Science | 114 | 37 | 41 | 37 | 43 | 44 | 21 | 39 |
| Psychology | 41 | 26 | 45 | 46 | 37 | 47 | 27 | 36 |
| Social Thought | 5 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 67 | 0 |
| Sociology | 60 | 31 | 60 | 53 | 38 | 41 | 28 | 57 |

TABLE 12— Continued

| Academic Unit | (A) Number Who Applied for Aid | | (B) Percent of Column A Who Were Offered Aid | | (C) Percent of Column B Who Entered | | (D) Percent of Those Not Offered Aid Who Entered | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| *Humanities* | | | | | | | | |
| Art | 18 | 27 | 15 | 10 | 38 | 38 | 33 | 23 |
| Classical Languages and Literatures | 13 | 13 | 37 | 18 | 29 | 29 | 17 | 19 |
| Comparative Literature | 11 | 13 | 38 | 26 | 31 | 18 | 7 | 17 |
| English | 139 | 130 | 20 | 17 | 42 | 54 | 25 | 24 |
| Far Eastern Languages and Civilizations | 14 | 10 | 27 | 55 | 64 | 59 | 20 | 38 |
| General Studies | 8 | 11 | 36 | 41 | 67 | 64 | 44 | 45 |
| Germanic Languages and Literatures | 14 | 17 | 30 | 39 | 38 | 60 | 17 | 23 |
| History | 41 | 18 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 50 | 21 | 17 |
| History of Culture | 8 | 3 | 17 | 67 | 75 | 50 | 53 | 33 |
| Linguistics | 21 | 17 | 42 | 26 | 19 | 19 | 28 | 25 |
| Music | 11 | 6 | 47 | 29 | 69 | 80 | 31 | 22 |
| Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations | 21 | 13 | 23 | 24 | 47 | 33 | 35 | 45 |
| Philosophy | 49 | 13 | 31 | 42 | 29 | 47 | 19 | 26 |
| Slavic Languages and Literatures | 22 | 14 | 33 | 19 | 45 | 50 | 27 | 27 |
| Romance Languages and Literatures | 23 | 39 | 22 | 21 | 40 | 72 | 16 | 22 |
| South Asian Languages and Civilizations | 6 | 6 | 53 | 42 | 56 | 50 | 25 | 18 |

[a] In the College and the School of Business, financial aid is given on the basis of need, and the data are therefore not comparable to these. For the other professional schools, data were not available in comparable form.

this report on career plans of women students) or the judgment that among Ph.D.s, women are less likely than men to make full use of the training throughout their lifetimes and that accordingly scarce fellowship money should be given more frequently to men.

In this connection we call attention to the danger of the self-fulfilling prophecy: If women are offered less aid because they are regarded as poorer risks, they may indeed turn out to be poorer risks because of lesser aid. Each academic unit should guard against the possibility that, even where there is evidence that women have been poorer risks in this sense, they are not penalized in the present for that which may have been true in the past.*

It is also worth noting that the Committee received a number of complaints from women students that their respective departments were discriminating against women with respect to financial aid. In the light of these complaints and the data in Table 12, *we recommend that each department review its policies and procedures regarding student financial aid*. In this last connection we note that some departments, in order to keep students informed about their aid policies and procedures, invite students to participate in their processes of evaluating applications. In academic units in which awards are based on financial need rather than merit, the confidentiality of the information regarding financial need, of course, is an obstacle to such student participation.

The Committee discussed the advisability of seeking special scholarship and fellowship funds for women students, especially to support married women for whom relatively small amounts of money would provide for domestic and child care assistance and thus enable the women to devote full time to their studies. We did not agree; some of us were persuaded that such funds should be sought, others were persuaded that this might represent a "separatist" move that would be of no long-run benefit to women or to the University; and others warned that the presence of such funds might lead merely to a shifting of regular funds to the support of more men and thus defeat the purpose.

We suggest that the problem mentioned in the preceding paragraph be referred to the future Committee on Women's Affairs. We suggest also that that Committee keep in touch with the departments and schools as they review their financial aid policies.

*Aid for Tandem Teams*

We have earlier discussed the problems of the tandem (husband-wife) team as they relate to faculty. The numbers of married couples in which both husband and wife are students in the University are already increasing at a rapid rate. The particular problem for the University relates to financial support of both members of the couple. The problem takes somewhat different forms when both persons wish to enroll in the same department or when the two wish to enroll in different departments. Admissions committees sometimes are concerned that there may be "double risk" in allotting scarce scholarship money, since if one of the two persons is not admitted, the other is also likely to turn down the offer of admission; or if the first decides to leave the University after a year, the second is likely also to withdraw. In some instances, furthermore, the woman applicant hesitates to notify her department that her husband is also seeking financial support, presuming that this fact will operate against her.

The Committee recognizes the complex problems involved but believes there is no alternative but for both the department and the applicant to proceed in full candor and to arrive at decisions based solely on the applicant's merit.

## C. Attrition Rates

At the national level there is a great deal of evidence that once embarked on a college or graduate program, fewer women than men complete their degree programs, and those women who complete take a longer time to do so. What has been the experience at this University?

*Attitudes Bearing on Attrition: Aspiration, Motivation, Perceived Support*

Responses to the questionnaire administered in October 1969 suggest high career commitment by women at The University of Chicago, challenging the commonly held notion that women are less committed as students than men. When asked what they expected to be doing ten years from now, 91 percent of the women respondents expected to be involved in a career as compared with 94 percent of the men (Appendix E, Question #49). Only 5 to 6 percent of our women respondents said they would like or expected to be occupied with family alone ten years from now. Women and men appear to feel equally favorable about going to or being in graduate school (#21). Furthermore, 62 percent of the women and 53 percent of the men respondents indicated that they would be "very disappointed" if they left school before completing their education (#56).

We inquired to what extent social support might be a factor affecting the motivations and aspirations, and thus the attrition rates, of women. We differed in our interpretation of evidence from the questionnaire (#21, #51). It was apparent to all of us that a very large proportion of both women and men respondents perceived middling to strong support from those affectively nearest--parents, spouses, boy and girl friends--for pursuing graduate work and careers. Some of us were impressed with the systematic differential unfavorable to women between the proportions of men and women perceiving support from significant other persons. Some thought this differential should not be given much emphasis because it could be largely accounted for by those who answered "don't know" to these questions. Those of us who emphasized the differential interpreted the "don't know" responses to mean that the respondent failed to perceive positive support. Others of us thought we had no basis for giving these responses other than a neutral interpretation. We agreed that for both men and women the amount of support perceived to be forthcoming from faculty members was lower than from other categories of persons, a finding which suggests that faculty members might review whether they are generally giving support to the aspirations of their students, and particularly to those students who are women.*

The Committee has examined data on actual attrition rates in the University. We have been hampered by the absence of adequate records, but we have managed to gather some meager information.

*Attrition in the College*

Table 13 presents data on attrition in the College and shows that there is slightly higher probability for women than for men to drop out during an academic year. The difference, however, is small. From interviews with College advisers and in reports from the Dean of Student's office, it appears that the most frequent reasons for both men and women withdrawals are related to personal-psychological problems or general dissatisfaction with the College. No consistent differences between men and women are to be found in the reasons for dropping out.

To pursue the question further we attempted to carry out a cohort analysis for the students admitted to selected departments in each of the four divisions for the years 1962, 1963, and 1964. This proved to be a formidable task which we were able to carry through in only one department in each division.

The information for each of four departments is shown in Table 14. (The departments are not named, since in some instances changes in admission policies have occurred in the intervening years, and present cohorts may be presumed to be following a somewhat different course.) These data are merely illustrative, but they indicate that: 1) no consistent differences seem to exist between men and women so far as leaving before finishing a degree; 2) women more frequently than men stop at the master's level. Where we have information regarding the reasons for leaving after a master's degree, it is clear that women leave for a wide variety of reasons in addition to inadequate performance for the Ph.D., while there is some greater tendency for men to leave because of poor performance. This statement must be qualified by the realization that there are other reasons, including changes in career plans, that lead men to stop after the master's degree. The general belief that women differ from men as far as highest degree expected is concerned is supported by the data from the student survey (Appendix E, #15, and Table E.1) which indicate that women expect to stop at the master's level more frequently than do men. It is strongly supported also by the data in Table 9 where the proportion of women to men taking master's degrees is shown to be much higher than the proportion of women to men taking Ph.D.'s.

The data in Table 14 would be more useful in this connection if amounts of financial aid given to the men and to the women were known. It may be that men in these four departments received more aid than the women and that this may be an important factor in accounting for the differences in the patterns.

The Committee was able to pursue this last question in the Ford-supported program in the Department of English. Here, after a rigorous selection process, both men and women students were supported equally (tuition plus cash stipend). The data shown in Table 15 indicate that even here a higher proportion of women than men end at the master's level.

Reasons for withdrawals are not known in this instance, but in another department where relatively full information on dropouts was available, and where some one hundred cases were analyzed in total, it was clear that marital status was not a significant variable. In that group of Ph.D. candidates it was the single men who more often dropped out, while the married men finished; and while

TABLE 13

Attrition in the College

| College | Percent Withdrawing during the Year | | | Total Enrollment |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | Men | Women | |
| 1965-66 | 13% | 12% | 14% | 2,321 |
| 1966-67 | 16 | 15 | 17 | 2,485 |
| 1967-68 | 18 | 17 | 19 | 2,470 |

TABLE 14

Cohort Analyses for Selected Departments (Students Entered 1962, 1963, 1964)

| One Department in Each Division | Total Admitted[a] | Left before Degree | Master's Degree Only | Ph.D Completed | Still Working |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Biological Sciences* | | | | | |
| Men | 18 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 3 |
| Women | 9 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| *Physical Sciences* | | | | | |
| Men | 132 | 21 | 17 | 69 | 25 |
| Women | 25 | 5 | 12 | 6 | 2 |
| *Social Sciences* | | | | | |
| Men | 50 | 20 | 2 | 14 | 14 |
| Women | 43 | 22 | 3 | 7 | 11 |
| *Humanities* | | | | | |
| Men | 134 | 32 | 66[b] | 15 | 21 |
| Women | 114 | 22 | 79[b] | 7 | 6 |

[a]Some enter with advanced degrees.

[b]In this department, admission into the Ph.D. program is determined only after completion of the M.A. These two entries include thirteen men and nine women, respectively, who were admitted to the Ph.D. but who dropped out thereafter.

TABLE 15

Cohort Analysis for Students in Ford-supported Program in English (Students Entered 1964, 1965, 1966)

| Sex | Total Admitted | Left before Degree | Master's Only | Admitted to Ph.D. but Withdrew | Still Working |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Men | 32 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 18 |
| Women | 30 | 2 | 18 | 4 | 6 |

the differences were not clear among the women, there was no tendency for the married women to be the dropouts.

Fragmentary as these data may be, they warn against the too easy conclusion that the fact that the individual is married is a more important factor in affecting the academic progress of a woman than of a man in this University. While *plans* for marriage and family undoubtedly affect women more than men with regard to highest degree expected, the timing of graduate study, and the choice of field of study, it should be kept in mind that selectivity operates prior to admission and that the student, man or woman, who decides to enter this University for a graduate degree is one whose motivation for an academic or professional career cannot be assessed on the basis of knowing his or her plans for marriage and family or by knowing his or her present family status. While the factors operating in any given case are of course complex, the implication is clear that women as a group must be taken as seriously as men at every step of the way and that financial aid and other forms of encouragement must be equally forthcoming.

These remarks should not be taken to imply that this Committee believes that all women graduate students must aim at and complete the Ph.D. degree (nor, for that matter, that all college women should pursue graduate programs). The diversity of life styles among women is fortunately increasing, as is the variety of satisfying careers that do not depend on the Ph.D. This Committee welcomes the diversity and encourages freedom of choice. We recognize also that to begin, but not to complete, a graduate program usually is not a waste of time or resources—that many of today's dropouts are tomorrow's degree-holders and that changes in career plans, for both men and women, are common. All these factors notwithstanding, the role of the University must be to encourage women as well as men to advance their talents.

The evidence is accumulating, furthermore, that women Ph.D.s maintain a high degree of career commitment. For example, a recent study of all women who took Ph.D.s in 1957-58 shows that 91 percent were working in 1965, most of them in high-level academic positions, and that when they interrupted their work careers, they did so only for a short time.[12] These facts alone argue against the view—if indeed that view is still to be found on this campus—that is it not worthwhile to develop talent in women.

The fact that women show higher attrition rates than men must not be regarded with complacency. In this connection the Committee found considerable flexibility in some departments and considerable effort to accommodate the student who needs to move from full-time to part-time study for a period of time, who needs to take a leave of absence (as, for instance, for maternity), or who needs continued dissertation supervision from a distance. In other departments we found relative indifference to these problems. The Committee urges all departments and schools to examine their procedures to see that no irrelevant obstacles that might contribute to attrition are put in the path of women.

[12]Helen S. Astin, *The Woman Doctorate in America* (New York: The Russell Sage Foundation, 1970).

## D. Career Plans of Women

The Committee has available two sets of self-report data regarding the career plans of women as compared to men students. The first was provided by the Office of Career Counseling and Placement, based on the statements made at the time of graduation by men and women who took degrees in 1968-69. The second came from the student questionnaire administered by this Committee in October 1969.

The Career Office data indicate that of students taking the bachelor's degree in that year, 72 percent of the men and 52 percent of the women planned to go on to graduate school. Of the women who planned to continue, three-fourths expected to enter one or another field in the arts and sciences, but only 1 woman of the total 184 planned to enter the field of law; only 6 the field of medicine; only 3 business.

The student questionnaire, on the other hand, suggested more boldness on the part of the women in considering what have not been traditionally female fields, with 6 percent expressing an interest in physical sciences; 6 percent in medicine; 9 percent in law; and 2 percent each in business and divinity (Appendix E, #22). It may be that because views among student generations change rapidly our questionnaire is tapping new views emerging even since the 1968-69 class reported to Career Counseling. Or it may be that a questionnaire elicits bold hopes, while reports to placement counselors elicit more modest self-estimates of the future. In any case we note that while compared to other undergraduate institutions an unusually high proportion of our women college graduates plan to continue their education, they nevertheless select very traditional fields of study.

*Highest Degree Expected and Fields of Study*

We have referred earlier to the high level of expressed female career commitment. However, women aspire somewhat more modestly than men in terms of highest degree expected. Among those who graduated with M.A. or M.S. degrees in 1968-69, 61 percent of the men but only 35 percent of the women, according to the Career Counseling data, planned to continue toward the doctorate. (Of those who expected to take jobs, a significantly higher proportion of women than of men planned to become secondary school teachers.)

These data are confirmed by the student questionnaire (Appendix E, #15, and Table E.1). Over the University as a whole a higher proportion of men than women expect to go on to a Ph.D. While in three academic units a higher proportion of women than men aspired to the highest academic degree, in nine academic units it was a lower proportion of women. (As already indicated, the finding also is confirmed by the data in Table 9 which show a higher proportion of men than women are actually completing Ph.D. degrees at this University.)

Members of this Committee do not see eye to eye with respect to the interpretation to be

placed on these two sets of data. Some of us are gratified that University women as a group are so committed to higher education and to adult careers. Others of us feel disappointed that, given the educational opportunities provided on this campus, our women students are not more unconventional with regard to the fields they choose and the highest career aspirations they express. Those of us who hold the latter view note that the gap between unconventional career hopes expressed in the questionnaire and the conventional choices made at graduation might be somewhat narrowed in favor of the former if better academic counseling were provided. We wonder to what extent the fault lies in failing to make women aware of the various career opportunities open to them, of the ways in which women in all fields are combining family and job, and so on. In this connection the Committee notes with approval the new series of career seminars for undergraduate women and other recent activities undertaken by the Office of Career Counseling and Placement to assist women before as well as at the time of graduation.

Since the shaping of career attitudes is presumably a significant, if latent, function of faculty, we note with concern that 9 percent of the women responding to the student questionnaire had perceived, as it were, negative career counseling from University faculty whom they had heard say that a particular field in which a woman was interested has little or no career possibilities for women (Appendix E, #29B). The Committee assumes to the contrary that there are no fields left in which a competent and committed woman cannot make her mark.

Related to these issues are other responses from the questionnaire. More women respondents (41 percent) than men (19 percent) felt that faculty members were less receptive to students of their own sex (#47). More men than women felt that male faculty members were "very favorable" or "somewhat favorable" toward their being in graduate school or toward their pursuing careers (#21, #51). Further, 6 percent of the men and 9 percent of the women reported having heard a faculty member express beliefs that women's minds were unsuited to certain fields. Even though these perceptions may have been reported by only a minority, they nevertheless merit attention (#29A).

However, women respondents' reports of actual experiences with faculty strongly contrast with their perceptions of generalized faculty attitudes. With one exception, men and women report similar personal experiences. The one exception concerns the frequency with which students report being invited to take part in discussions with a group of faculty members (#33), where men seem to be favored. On the other hand, women (43 percent) and men (38 percent) feel encouraged "frequently" after discussion with a faculty member (#28). Women and men (86 percent) feel equally free to go to at least one faculty member about academic matters, and women (32 percent) and men (35 percent) feel equally free to go to at least one faculty member about personal matters (# 30). Women and men feel they are encouraged by about the same number of faculty members in their field (#31). Women and men feel that their adviser is accessible (#34). With equal frequency they feel that their adviser is usually very helpful or somewhat helpful (#35).

It must be, then, that women students who perceive differential encouragement from that of men are responding to what they perceive as underlying attitudes rather than to actual actions of faculty members with respect to career encouragement.* Their responses to the questionnaire are reminiscent of the phenomenon mentioned in the first part of this report relative to the attitudes of women faculty—namely, that while it is difficult to find tangible evidence of differential treatment, some women sense a set of covert attitudes that detract from their full measure of encouragement.*

While it is difficult to legislate against such attitudes, the Committee hopes that a heightened awareness of this problem by faculty members may itself prove beneficial to those women students who would gain from more direct expressions of encouragement.

*Undergraduate Career Counseling*

In inquiring into other aspects of career counseling, members of the Committee interviewed a number of College Advisers. The impression we gained is that there are no major problems in placing women students in suitable graduate schools, although it is sometimes more difficult to obtain financial aid for a woman than for a man. The situation varies considerably from field to field. Advisers reported that in the humanities, where funds are short for both men and women, obtaining fellowships for women may be more difficult than in other areas. In the physical sciences, women who are not discouraged by a first refusal may end up with good fellowships in very good schools. In applying to professional schools women may now actually have the advantage over men.

The essential issue, however, is the career advising that undergraduate women receive. As already noted, we are concerned that relatively few women at this University are entering nontraditional fields. While it may be that most College Advisers and faculty raise the sights of women students, some may unwittingly discourage undergraduates from making graduate and professional plans. Such discouragement may be largely unconscious and may reflect the feeling that women will have a more difficult time in future schooling.

Another problem which arises in this area concerns faculty advising. At present this is done on an informal basis, but one adviser felt that faculty should counsel undergraduates about graduate schools, because advisers are equipped to do so only in general terms. Many students of course do seek out faculty members for advice or are sent to particular faculty members by their College Advisers, but in general departments have no special procedure for career counseling beyond the College Adviser system. Given this situation, women as well as men may not be receiving adequate information and advice.

*We recommend, therefore, that the College advising system be reviewed in order to raise the sights of women students by giving more adequate information regarding career opportunities and to improve counseling by developing a more adequate relationship among faculty, advisers, and students.*

*Graduate Counseling and Placement*

The Committee sought information also about procedures for counseling and placement of graduate students by talking to departmental chairmen or to departmental counselors or administrative assistants. It was uniformly reported that students with the Ph.D. are helped with placement by their thesis advisers or by chairmen, and some departments have special placement officers or faculty placement committees. (Students with bachelor's and master's degrees are placed

largely through the Office of Counseling and Placement rather than through departments.) Departmental respondents generally said they had no students who were particularly difficult to place, although students who were occasionally mentioned in this category were those with health problems and those who were married women.* Counseling of graduate students is generally carried on informally, although a number of departments hold special orientation meetings to inform students of career opportunities. Departments seem to vary enormously in the degree to which attention is given to career counseling; and our survey suggests that much more might be done in some departments not only to counsel students throughout, but to place women graduates as advantageously as men. In this connection, departments should make certain that all placement opportunities are made known to its women as well as to its men graduates. It should never be assumed in advance that a woman will not be interested in a given position, nor that prospective employers, especially those in high-status institutions, would not be interested in a woman.

In particular, with regard to the last point, this Committee suggests that departments and schools make known on all appropriate occasions the University's efforts to comply with Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which bars discrimination in employment on the basis of sex. Departments and schools can sometimes take initiative in this matter; and the Office of Career Counseling and Placement, although its record is good, should also seek new opportunities to extend the University's influence in this regard.

Finally, with regard to careers, the Committee has not undertaken a study of the atcual career achievements of women graduates of The University of Chicago. Such a study would have been enormously costly, but more important, we felt it would be of questionable worth because that which holds true for women graduates of ten or even five years ago is not likely to be predictive for present students. The pace of social change is rapid, and levels of aspirations and opportunities for University women are likely to change even more quickly in the next few years than in the past few.

## E. Older Students

The academic programs of the graduate departments and professional schools of the University are presently geared to the needs of students who have just completed or are only a few years removed from their undergraduate work. This is appropriate, since the large majority of students who pursue graduate work do so in their youth. At the same time there exists a pool of more mature persons, many of them women, who would be valuable students if the climate were more favorable to their pursuing advanced degrees.

Given on the one hand its presently age-graded student body, and on the other hand the prevailing life-styles of women, the University is probably losing more of the talent available in mature women than in mature men.

The Committee does not know the numbers of mature women (or men) who live in

the immediate vicinity and who would be successful students at this University. Neither do we know the number who are both qualified and motivated, who inquire about admission and are then encouraged or discouraged from applying. We suspect, however, that the number of qualified women who would enter if encouraged to do so is greater than reflected in the present number enrolled.

For instance, in autumn 1968, of a total enrollment of some 6,000 men and women graduate students on the University quadrangles, only 116 were women aged thirty or over, married with children. Of these, half were pursuing master's degrees and half, doctoral degrees. (The 116 were distributed as follows: 29 in Humanities; 38 in Social Sciences; 4 in Biological Sciences; 2 in Physical Sciences; 4 in the Graduate School of Education; 16 in Social Service Administration; 8 in the Graduate Library School; 2 in the Divinity School; and 13 unspecified.) Many of these women had begun as part-time students, then moved to full time as their degree programs progressed.

The advantages and disadvantages of admitting older students are probably differently perceived in various parts of the University. For example, it is a common view in the physical and biological sciences that both men and women make their greatest contributions early in life; and this view becomes translated into a policy of admitting only young persons. (This view is supported by the present evidence, although the interpretation to be drawn from that evidence is unclear—i.e., if the supportive institutional arrangements were present, would those persons who begin later in life also become creative scientists, and would productive young scholars remain productive for longer periods of their lives?) The situation is differently described in the humanities and social sciences, where age is more often recognized as an advantage. Nevertheless, while the Committee found no instance of an official bar to the admission of older students, we recognized a reluctance on the part of many, if not most, departments to admit older students, even when those departments are in humanities or social sciences.

Some members of the Committee believe that in meeting its goal of recruiting the best possible student body, the University would benefit from a somewhat greater range in the age-mix of our student body, perhaps at the undergraduate as well as at the graduate level. We suggest therefore that departments and schools reconsider their current practices regarding the admission of older students. Probably in no instance should an arbitrary age limit exist.

In this connection, furthermore, because many mature persons are unsure of their ability to succeed once again as a student, departments should, where appropriate, institute procedures which will enable students who are returning to academia after a prolonged absence to make the transition smoothly. In many instances this will require only a few sessions of academic counseling; in other instances, admission on an initial part-time basis; in still other instances, admission as a nondegree student for a short period of time. (It might be pointed out in this connection that the practice followed by some departments in placing such students on probationary status may exacerbate rather than alleviate their transition to the student role.)

## F. Part-time Students

As implied in the preceding paragraphs, the issues with regard to older students are related to issues regarding part-time students.

We inquired of department chairmen whether they would favor increasing the number of part-time women students in their departments. About half said no; half said yes, but only under special circumstances. Of those who were more or less favorable, most were chairmen of departments where such arrangements already exist.

The greatest resistance is to the initial enrollment of graduate students on a part-time basis and is focussed on three points: 1) with a limited number of spaces available, the full-time student must be favored over the part-time; 2) the department needs a year of full-time work to know if the student can succeed in a graduate program; 3) one year's full-time participation is necessary to "acculturate" a student into the intellectual environment of the department. The resistance was less to the second- or third-year student being part time. Faced with the choice of a full-time or a part-time student making claims on scholarship funds, the overwhelming response was in favor of the full-time student. It seems apparent that if special funds were available for their support, chairmen would be much more favorable to admitting part-time students.

Meanwhile the present Committee recognizes that The University of Chicago, given its goals, is unsuited to meeting the educational needs of certain women, talented as they may be, or of adapting its programs to the varied life-styles of women—as, for instance, by encouraging large numbers of part-time students, by making major accommodation to nonresident students, or by undertaking special career programs for women. On the other side of the coin, it must also be acknowledged that many mature women find the University's degree requirements unnecessarily rigid or dysfunctional or they find graduate study less challenging than they had anticipated. Recognizing the validity of both sets of factors, the University must make every effort to encourage those women who are strongly motivated toward academic achievement, whatever their life patterns and their outside commitments.

### *Child Care*

In the first part of this report we discussed problems of child care and recommended that a clearinghouse of information regarding child care facilities be established to serve the entire University. That this need is particularly great for students is indicated by the responses to the student questionnaire, in which 33 percent of the men with children and 77 percent of the women with children implied that their academic work was interfered with by the need to care for their children (Appendix E, #7B).

## G. Campus Student Life

At various points in our investigations, the Committee has been aware that many problems of women students are so entangled with general problems concerning the nature of student life that they cannot be separated. Some of these relate to University-community relations, some to life in the city, some to the role of the student in improving the wider society. The University itself has sometimes been described as dehumanizing and lacking in a spirit of community. Today, as in 1951 when W. C. Bradbury reported to the College, students are "not happy enough." Some of these problems may have a special impact on women students.

We discussed, for example, certain facilities which might provide greater opportunities for social interaction, such as the establishment of more small coffee shops like the one in the Divinity School, Nonesuch in Wieboldt, Mandala in Cobbs, the South Asia Lounge in Foster, and Bandersnatch in Ida Noyes, each of which draws a steady clientele. We also considered a small version of a student union which might unite students across divisions and schools. To have pursued these ideas in any detail would, we felt, have distracted us from our main charge. We mention them only to suggest that some problems affecting women can yield only to larger solutions affecting the entire student body.

### *Student Housing*

Student housing was another matter that came briefly to our attention. The issue of coeducational housing is one on which the sentiments of women vary considerably; and because other groups and individuals have made this their concern, we have not addressed ourselves to the problem. Housing for undergraduate women and men, although it is still far from adequate in meeting the varied needs of the student body, appears to have improved considerably in the past two years. House sizes have been decreased, more single rooms have been provided, and house autonomy is becoming a reality. More upper-class women are remaining in the housing system, and resident heads are able to develop closer relationships with students. The housing situation for unmarried graduate women, however, poses a grave problem. The residences presently available are in poor condition, and there appears to be some concensus that both coed and segregated buildings are needed. The Committee recognizes that this situation is well-known, but nevertheless *we recommend that the needs of single graduate women for both on-campus and off-campus housing be given attention as a top priority by University officials.*

### *Gynecological Services*

As was to be anticipated, the Committee heard a variety of other complaints. One in particular was discontent with gynecological services in Student Health, on grounds that appointments were often delayed and that some studens had encountered moral rather than medical advice. Our inquiries showed that when, some six years ago, the University first offered gynecological and contraceptive advice to students, in the context of individual consultation between patient and

doctor, it was the first University health service to do so; that the service became overtaxed; that the responsibility has now been transferred from the Student Health Clinic to Lying-in Hospital; and that delays in routine appointments have now been diminished.[13] With regard to the second issue, we have ascertained that it is the explicit policy of the Student Health Service to provide not moral but only medical advice. In an area where nuance weighs heavily, we do not rule out the possibility that suppliers of advice may unwisely and unwittingly use medical messages to convey moral meanings, nor that consumers of advice may, equally unwisely or unwittingly, misconstrue medical messages. Beyond this comment, the Committee is content to leave the problem to the medical staff.

*The Student Survey*

The concern of the Committee for the problems faced by women students at The University of Chicago is reflected in the discussion of the responses to the questionnaire. Attention has been focussed more sharply on the ways in which women students differ from men students in their perceptions and experiences than on their similarities. The majority of the Committee, however, is much more impressed by the similarities between the responses of men and women students than by the relatively small number of differences. This is not to say that the differences that do exist are trivial or are to be ignored, but only to point out more forcefully perhaps than already indicated that the overwhelming impression one gets from studying the data is that men and women students at Chicago report the same problems, experience the same satisfactions, and in general participate equally in both the joys and frustrations of student life. It is clear that students have many problems and dissatisfactions. But it is equally clear that most, although certainly not all, of these are student problems and not specifically women's problems.*

*Courses on the Subject of Women*

The Committee undertook a mail survey inquiring of faculty members what courses or parts of courses they were teaching and what researches they were engaged in or were supervising that relate to the subject of women (their history, roles, opportunities, contributions) or on a subject where the sex variable is of major importance. A few faculty members responded at length; but

[13]Beginning in June 1970, the number of student clinic days per week in Lying-in is to increase; most of the total clinic time will be used for "walk-ins" rather than for appointments; the student clinic and waiting room in Lying-in will be separate from the public; informational films and consultation will be available continuously across the hall from the student waiting room during clinic hours; there will be additional educational sessions in a large classroom in Lying-in; regular telephone consultation will be available five days a week; and emergency assistance will be possible seven days a week.

The staff is writing literature specifically for University students on reproduction, birth control, and venereal infections. This literature will be distributed to men, as well as women, through the Student Health Clinic and also at a booth at Registration. It appears to our Committee that the student gynecological clinic in Lying-in Hospital is making a commendable effort at the present time to be responsive to the needs of the women it serves.

over all the responses were few. Either the questionnaires went unnoticed by many (they were mailed just before the Christmas holidays), or little attention is presently being given to "women's issues," whether in courses in the humanities, social sciences, or the professional schools.

The Committee notes, on the other hand, that in the current academic year, a new two-quarter course entitled "The Sociology of Women" has been introduced, cross-listed in the Collegiate Social Sciences Division and in the Department of Sociology; and a new course entitled "The Social Psychology of Women" is cross-listed in the Graduate School of Business and the Departments of Psychology and Sociology. We note also the creation of informal teaching and learning groups, such as the seminar organized by women students in the Law School to study legal problems relating specifically to women. The Committee welcomes these new developments and hopes there will be an increase in all parts of the University in both teaching and research activities that relate specifically to the lives of women.*

# III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The status of women in this University, their achievements and their frustrations, are inextricably intertwined with the larger question of the position of women in the broader society. We recognize that this report emerges at a time when a new awareness of women's needs is coming to national attention. Not all of the Committee holds the same views regarding the directions for needed social change, the ways in which the relations between the sexes can or should be modified, or what the role of the University should be in these regards. We have not attempted to reconcile our differences on any broader scale than necessary to produce a report focussed on the local issues at hand. We have asked how The University of Chicago, given its special characteristics and special educational goals, can best discharge its responsibilities toward women. We have concluded that the primary task is to insure that we recruit, then encourage, talented and dedicated women as well as men students and faculty and to insure that the University is making the most of its opportunities in regard to both the talent pool from which it draws and the talent pool to which it contributes. In short, we should be making every effort to insure the full participation and the contributions of women in pursuing the overall goal of the University for academic preeminence.

In the preceding pages we have identified certain problems for faculty women and student women in this University. We have made a number of recommendations in the context of our findings and a larger number of interpretations and suggestions which, because of the complexity of the issues involved, do not lend themselves to recommendations. We have concluded that by-and-large the problems that can be alleviated by changes in University procedures stem more from faults of omission than of commission, more from lack of awareness than from deliberate acts of discrimination.

Without repeating all the points we regard as salient, we list below our major findings and our specific recommendations:

1. With regard to women on the regular teaching faculty, the problem is that there are so few of them. We are particularly puzzled by the absence of faculty women in certain areas of the University where the potential pools contain substantial proportions of women.

We recommend that departments and schools review their recruitment procedures to determine whether, in fact, they are exploring the total pool of excellence, especially with regard to women. For example, in making oral or written inquiries, the department should specify that it is interested in hearing about able women as well as able men.

2. There apparently has been considerable flexibility on the part of chairmen and deans in making arrangements to keep the women, as well as the men, they want to keep, although the extent of this flexibility has often gone unrecognized. For at least the present group of faculty women, we are impressed with the extent to which mutually satisfactory arrangements have been worked out to accommodate their needs.

We recommend that the flexibility utilized in the past in terms of shifts from research associate to teaching faculty, part time to full time and vice versa, leaves of absence, maternity leaves, and the like be continued since it has made it possible to retain women of high calibre who might otherwise have been lost to the University; and that this flexibility be made better known.

3. With regard to appointments of close relatives, University policy has been altered in recent years toward greater flexibility and the so-called "nepotism convention" is now nonexistent.

We recommend that the current interpretation of the University's policy be more widely publicized by a statement from the Provost distributed to all academic employees. We recommend further that such a statement forego the terms "nepotism" and "anti-nepotism" and that it be couched primarily in terms of anti-favoritism.

4. We have carried out a systematic study with regard to faculty salaries. The data do not indicate to us that over all the salaries received by faculty women differ substantially from those received by men who are considered to be their equals in terms of amount and kind of talent and dedication of their talent to University employment.

5. With regard to promotions and tenure, we have not been able to make a systematic study to see if differential treatment exists for men and women now or in the past, because the necessary data did not exist.

6. The women who occupy both "ladder" and "non-ladder" faculty positions are enormously varied with respect to life styles and career lines and with respect to the patterns of their contributions in teaching, research, administration, and outside professional activities. As a group they confirm none of the usual clichés about academic women.

7. For the most part, faculty women reported satisfaction, described their work situations as gratifying and their positions as ones that provided freedom to pursue their teaching and research interests in ways that were personally rewarding.

8. Among both students and faculty we recognize the growing number of husband-wife teams (the tandem team) in which the academic goals of both members must be accommodated; and we have made certain suggestions pertaining thereto.

9. Among the problems reported was that of child care arrangements, a problem posed for men as well as for women. Most of us applaud the efforts of the Walker Committee regarding a child care center, but such a center is only one of the alternative forms of child care which would suit different families.

We recommend that a clearinghouse for information on child care facilities be established, as either a direct or indirect responsibility of the University, and that it serve the entire University community—students, academic employees, and nonacademic employees.

10. We have given special attention to the positions of lecturers and research associates, and we are impressed with the extent to which these positions are being utilized in flexible

ways to meet both the needs of the University and the needs of the women who fill them. For the problems involved, our suggestions lie as much in the realm of self-consciousness on the part of women as of institutional remedies; but we hope, for instance, that department chairmen and other senior colleagues would encourage able young women to convert a job orientation into a career orientation just as they encourage male junior colleagues to do so. We call to the attention of the faculties certain problems with the position of lecturer, whether for a man or a woman.

11. We have reviewed the data on student admissions and find that the distribution of *applicants* by sex among various fields of study corresponds fairly closely to the distribution of *entrants* by sex. Women applicants are admitted in slightly higher proportions than men.

12. With regard to financial aid, we have only very partial data, and then only with regard to the numbers of persons offered aid at the time of admission to the four graduate divisions. The overall pattern that emerges from these data is one in which women somewhat less frequently than men were offered aid. More useful data are lacking regarding the quality of applicants, the amount of aid offered in first and subsequent years, and so on.

We recommend that each department review its policies and procedures regarding student financial aid to insure that women are given aid on the same terms as men.

13. With regard to attrition rates, responses to the student survey suggest high career commitment by women; as high a proportion of women as men who plan to pursue careers; but in some graduate divisions a lower aspiration level for women so far as highest academic degree expected. The proportion of women to men now taking master's degrees is much higher than the proportion taking Ph.D.s. Hampered by the absence of adequate records, the Committee has only meager information on actual attrition rates.There is a slightly higher tendency for women than for men in the College to drop out during an academic year and fragmentary data indicate higher dropout rates for women at the graduate level, although the reasons for withdrawal are not clear.

We urge all departments and schools to examine their procedures to see that no irrelevant obstacles that might contribute to attrition–such as aid differentials–are being put in the path of women.

14. We inquired into various aspects of career counseling, noting among other things the relatively few women at this University who are entering nontraditional fields, although we find no field which is in fact barred to women.

We recommend that the College advising system be reviewed in order to raise the sights of student women by giving more adequate information regarding career opportunities and to improve counseling by developing a more adequate relationship among faculty, advisers, and students.

15. At the graduate level, departments and schools vary enormously in the degree to which attention is given to career counseling. We suggest that much more be done in some departments not only to counsel students throughout but to place women graduates as advantageously as men. We suggest also that departments and schools make known on all appropriate occasions the University's efforts to comply with Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which bars discrimination in employment on the basis of sex and to call this legislation to the attention of prospective employers.

16. With regard to older students, the University is probably losing more of the talent available in women than in men. We suggest that departments and schools reconsider their current practices regarding the admission of older students. Probably in no instance should an arbitrary age limit exist.

17. We inquired only briefly into various aspects of campus student life, in the awareness that many problems of student women are so entangled with general problems concerning the nature of student life that they cannot be separated from the problems of student men. One issue in particular, however, poses a grave problem—the housing situation for unmarried graduate women.

We recommend that the needs of single graduate women for both on-campus and off-campus housing be given attention as a top priority by University housing officials.

18. Findings from a questionnaire administered to some 1,100 undergraduate and graduate students in October 1969 indicate that in some ways student women differ from student men in their perceptions and experiences, but for the most part they report the same problems and experience the same dissatisfactions and frustrations. Most, although certainly not all, of the problems and dissatisfactions mentioned are student problems and not specifically women's problems.

19. Although the Committee has found little concrete evidence of differential treatment of men and women, we are nevertheless cognizant of an underlying set of attitudes in both faculty and students that women are not receiving their full share of rewards and encouragement on this campus. Such attitudes form an important part of social reality and must therefore be faced. Increased awareness of these attitudes by all members of the University community will itself be corrective, as will the implementation of the recommendations listed above. In addition to the actions that must be taken by the individual departments and schools, we believe also that a standing Committee on Women's Affairs can play an important role in changing these attitudes.

We recommend that a Committee on Women's Affairs be established to perform such functions as the following: 1) to provide more opportunities for information and contact between student women and faculty women; 2) to keep in touch with departments and schools as they review their student aid policies, and to consider the advisability of special scholarship funds for women; 3) to stimulate both faculty and students to carry out research on women and to assist in locating funds for such research; 4) to establish a visiting lecture series that will bring notable women to campus; 5) to arrange other programs of interest about women and their roles in society; 6) to suggest innovative programs that will tap presently underused sources of talent, such as the highly educated women, some of them faculty wives, whose family responsibilities preclude a regular work schedule but who would welcome a research or other scholarly involvement.

We rcommend further that the Committee on Women's Affairs include both men and women of the faculty and both men and women students*, that it report to the University from time to time with the explicit stipulation that it report on the status of women in the University at the end of two years; and that it be itself reviewed at that time in the hope that in the performance of its functions it shall have become a self-liquidating body.[14]

[14]We believe that the proposed Committee on Women's Affairs should be equipped with staff, notably with an influential senior and imaginative executive. Such a person should organize and coordinate the various functions pertaining to faculty and student women enumerated above, plus two more: 1) to gather, on a continuing basis, information of the kind this Committee has gathered to chart the situation of women in the University; 2) to assist department chairmen in their efforts to place spouses in the Chicago area by providing some general intelligence concerning suitable job appointments. Other members of this Committee believed that the proposed Committee on Women's Affairs should be free to decide for itself on the need for such an executive. We believe that this omission may deprive the future Committee of the energetic and continuous initiative which would assure its effectual functioning.

SUSANNE HOEBER RUDOLPH

ROSEMARIE GILLESPIE

MARY JENNINGS JOHNS

BARBARA BUGGERT LANE

BARBARA WAUGH

## APPENDIX A

## HOW VISIBLE ARE WOMEN IN THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY?

The data below, while not exhaustive, illustrate as of spring 1969 how infrequently women have gained special recognition for academic achievement; how seldom they have acted as spokesmen for the University; and perhaps of less moment, how rarely they have appeared in the administrative structure of the University.

There is a close relation between these data and Table 1 in the body of this report. Given the small number of women on the faculty, and their overrepresentation at lower academic ranks, it is not likely that women will appear often in positions of special recognition. In somewhat different words, were we to select a parallel sample of eighty-one faculty men, those men's names might not appear any more frequently in the tallies below.

### *FACULTY HONORS AND AWARDS*

*Distinguished Service Professorships* (established at various points in time. In 1969, 3 "named" professorships were changed to DSPs and 8 new DSPs were added, making a total of 23)

Total persons appointed ..... 85
Total women ..... 0

"*Named*" *Professorships* (established at various points in time, now total 45)

Total persons named ..... 106
Total women ..... 7*

*Samuel Deutsch Professors in Social Service Administration, 5 (appointed in 1929, 1942, 1957, 1967, 1969); William S. Gray Professor of Basic Research in Reading, 1 appointed in 1960; Edward Olson Professor of Greek, 1 in 1940.

"*Named*" *Visiting Professorships*

Total ..... 108
Total women ..... 4*

*Carpenter Visiting Professor in English, 2; Alexander White Visiting Professor, 1; Visiting Professor of Polish Literature, 1.

*University Professorships* (established 1962)

Total ..... 4
Total women ..... 0

*Quantrell Awards* (for excellence in undergraduate teaching, established 1937)

Total awarded ..... 116
Total women ..... 6
Total awarded in past 10 years* ..... 41
Total women in past 10 years ..... 1 (in 1960)

*Summer 1959 through spring 1969.

*Howard Taylor Ricketts Award* (for basic contribution to science, established 1913)
Total awarded ..... 54
Total women ..... 5 (all previous to 1937)

*Gordon Jennings Laing Prize* (for distinguished book published by University of Chicago Press, established 1962)
Total awarded ..... 6
Total women ..... 0

*Faculty spokesmen* at trustee-faculty dinners
Total faculty speakers ..... 48
Total women ..... 1 (in 1925)

## *HONORS TO NONFACULTY PERSONS*

*Honorary degrees* (by tradition University of Chicago honorary degrees are not awarded to persons whose major scholarly achievements were carried out at this University)
Total awarded (1891 to June 1969) ..... 321
Total women ..... 7
Total awarded in past 10 years ..... 114
Total women in past 10 years ..... 1 (in 1966)

*Rosenberger Medal* (for distinguished achievement in the advancement of learning or great service to human welfare, established 1917)
Total awarded ..... 23
Total women ..... 1 (in 1942)

*Convocation speakers*
Total ..... 322*
Total women ..... 7

*Total of 328 convocations through June 1969—6 without speakers. Women speakers in 1897, 1904, 1915, 1923, 1930, 1942, 1959.

## *ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS**

*We are cognizant of the important contributions being made in various areas of the University by women who hold administrative rather than academic appointments. As a subcommittee of the Council of the University Senate, however, we have been concerned only with academic appointments.

*Academic Deans* (of the College, divisions, professional schools)
Total since 1891 ..... data unavailable
Total women ..... 2*

*In Social Service Administration.

*Chairmen* (of departments, collegiate divisions, degree-granting committees)
Total since 1891 ..... data unavailable
Total women ..... 4*

*Germanic Languages, 2, Classics, 2. Refers to past and present of presently-existing departments. Does not include Nursing Education or Home Economics, both ended over a decade ago. Does not include Chairman of Women's Physical Education.

*Council of the University Senate* (51 members; 17 elected each year for 3-year terms)
Total elected in past 10 years ..... 170
Total women in past 10 years ..... 2

*Committee of the Council* (elected 7 members for 1-year terms)
Total in past 10 years ..... 70
Total women in past 10 years ..... 0

*Committee on Honorary Degrees*
Total in past 10 years ..... 70
Total women in past 10 years ..... 2

*The College Council* (40 members, half elected, half appointed for 3-year terms)
In June 1969, of the 40 members, 1 was a woman.

*College Governing Committees*
Of the 76 faculty members constituting the governing committees of the five collegiate divisions (omitting the collegiate masters, who are chairmen of the committees) in June 1969, 4 were women.

*University Boards, Committees, and Councils.* As listed in the University Directory, the number of these groups has fluctuated around 15 each year. They represent a diverse group of "standing" bodies, with faculty members appointed or reappointed for 1-year terms. Included are such groups as the Board of University Publications; the Board of Precollegiate Education; advisory committees on various funds, foundations, and lecture series; and the University Marshals. Approximately 100 to 110 faculty appointments or reappointments are made each year by the President or the Provost to these bodies. The participation of women over the past ten years can be estimated from the facts that in 1960, the names of 2 women appeared on the list; in 1964, 1; in 1969, 0.

*Ad hoc University Committees**. Appointed to carry out specific advisory or recommending functions, these committees have increased in number over the past few years. They have been varied in character and in length of tenure. Of 14 such committees appointed by the Committee of the Council of the University Senate in the period October 1966 through May 1969, 5 began as joint student-faculty; a few others added student members as their work proceeded. Included are such committees as one to study academic nepotism, one on minority group students, one on government contracts, one on problems relating to South Campus. Requests to faculty to serve on these Committees are made through the office of the Provost.

Records are not complete, but it appears that some 90 faculty members have served on these

14 Committees. Only one was a woman (on the committee to review disciplinary procedures, appointed in winter 1968). Because no record is available of the number of requests involved in obtaining the given number of acceptances, it cannot be determined if other women were asked to serve but declined.

In addition to committees appointed through the Council, it appears that some 6 additional University committees have been appointed in the last few years by the President or Provost, these dealing with matters more generally administrative in nature (although the line between this group of 6 and the preceding group of 14 committees is not a clearly drawn one). Included here is the committee on the bookstore, one on student records, one on the University's relation to the Woodlawn community. Only one of these 6 committees had a woman member (the student-faculty committee on social rules appointed in 1966).*

There is one notable exception to this overall picture: namely, the Gray Committee appointed by the Provost in January 1969 to review the decision on nonreappointment of a woman faculty member—an instance in which reputed discrimination because of sex was precisely one of the issues involved. The Gray Committee, composed of 3 women and 4 men, was chaired by a woman.

*Not included here are the many advisory committees operating within given units of the University (divisions, schools).

## APPENDIX B
## EARNED PH.D. DEGREES FROM LEADING UNIVERSITIES (BY SEX)[a]

| Academic Area | 1955-60 | | | | 1962-67 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Top 10 Universities[b] | | University of Chicago | | Top 10 Universities[b] | | University of Chicago | |
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| *Humanities* | | | | | | | | |
| Classics (Latin and Greek combined) | 65 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 120 | 33 | 8 | 1 |
| English and Literature | 633 | 126 | 48 | 7 | 847 | 231 | 34 | 8 |
| French | 99 | 56 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 62 | 2 | 4 |
| Spanish | 59 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 68 | 18 | 3 | 0 |
| German | 51 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 28 | 9 | 1 |
| Philosophy | 208 | 15 | 15 | 2 | 273 | 27 | 26 | 1 |
| *Social Sciences* | | | | | | | | |
| Anthropology | 146 | 30 | 31 | 8 | 233 | 64 | 48 | 7 |
| Economics | 449 | 22 | 64 | 1 | 601 | 33 | 73 | 1 |
| Geography | 129 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 161 | 14 | 22 | 0 |
| History | 563 | 68 | 46 | 6 | 789 | 111 | 82 | 7 |
| Political Science | 384 | 27 | 69 | 2 | 496 | 56 | 52 | 6 |
| Psychology | 600 | 131 | 85 | 20 | 599 | 165 | 25 | 9 |
| Sociology | 238 | 39 | 47 | 8 | 293 | 53 | 57 | 10 |
| *Physical Sciences* | | | | | | | | |
| Astronomy | 49 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 136 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| Chemistry | 1,167 | 69 | 76 | 2 | 1,381 | 112 | 102 | 8 |
| Geology (and/or Geophysics) | 408 | 9 | 29 | 0 | 472 | 9 | 34 | 2 |
| Mathematics | 386 | 26 | 53 | 2 | 739 | 34 | 57 | 5 |
| Physics | 786 | 20 | 55 | 3 | 1,361 | 28 | 99 | 2 |
| *Biological Sciences* | | | | | | | | |
| Microbiology (Bacteriology, Virology, Mycology, Parasitology) | 148 | 19 | 15 | 2 | 178 | 38 | 7 | 3 |
| Biochemistry | 166 | 28 | 18 | 2 | 248 | 49 | 18 | 8 |
| Biology (General)[c] | 140 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 36 | 2 | 0 |
| Zoology | 250 | 46 | 19 | 5 | 222 | 40 | 18 | 5 |
| Botany | 161 | 32 | 10 | 2 | 181 | 28 | 20 | 4 |
| Pharmacology | 33 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 80 | 11 | 16 | 5 |
| Physiology | 68 | 9 | 13 | 2 | 87 | 12 | 11 | 1 |

[a]Entries represent total number of Ph.D.s granted in each five-year period by the ten top-ranking universities. Where Chicago was ranked in the top 10, it has been exluded here and the eleventh university added. Quality rankings for 1955-60 are from H. Keniston, *Graduate Study in the Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959). Quality rankings for 1962-67 are from A. M. Cartter, *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966). Number of degrees taken from *Earned Degrees Conferred: Bachelor's and Higher Degrees* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, annually 1955-56 through 1966-67).

[b]The universities referred to vary from one field to the next and from one time interval to the next. For example, in Classics, 1955-60, they were Harvard, Yale, Princeton, California (all campuses), Columbia, Cornell, Michigan, Johns Hopkins, Illinois, North Carolina; in 1962-67, they were Harvard, Princeton, California at Berkeley, Bryn Mawr, Michigan, Yale, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Cincinnati, North Carolina.

[c]Quality rating for Zoology Departments used for General Biology degrees.

## APPENDIX C

## DECEMBER 15, 1969 DECISIONS ON REAPPOINTMENTS OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS[a]

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Promoted to tenure | 11 | 1 |
| Promoted (term) | 1 | 2 |
| Reappointed: | | |
| 1 year | 13 | 6 |
| 2 years | 4 | 1 |
| 3 years | 40 | 7 |
| 4 years | 4 | 0 |
| Resigned | 5 | 3 |
| Terminated | 9 | 0 |
| Total | 87 | 20 |

[a]The University Statutes provide that an instructor in the fourth year of appointment be notified by December 15 whether he will be promoted or terminated; an assistant professor in the last year of his initial term, whether or not he will be reappointed; and an assistant professor in the last year of his second term whether he will be promoted or terminated.

The rank of instructor has become rare. Of a total of four instructors for whom December 15 decisions were made, one was terminated, one was reappointed for one year, and two were promoted (term).

# APPENDIX D

## DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SUPPLY OF HIGHLY EDUCATED WOMEN

*Numbers of Women Faculty in U.S.*

In spring 1963 (the latest year for which data are available) women comprised 18 percent of the full-time teaching faculty (instructors and persons of higher academic rank) in universities and four-year colleges in the U.S. (see Table D.1).[1] The corresponding proportion for *universities*

TABLE D.1

Characteristics of Full-Time Teaching Faculty (Instructor or Above) in Universities and Four-Year Colleges, Spring 1963, by Sex

| Characteristics | Percentage | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Men (N = 113,560) | Women (N = 24,642) | Percent of Total Who Are Women |
| Total (N = 138,202) | 100 | 100 | 18 |
| Age (in years): | | | |
| Under 30 | 7 | 9 | 22 |
| 30-39 | 35 | 23 | 13 |
| 40-49 | 31 | 27 | 16 |
| 50-59 | 18 | 26 | 24 |
| 60-64 | 6 | 9 | 25 |
| 65 and over | 3 | 6 | 28 |
| Marital status: | | | |
| Married, spouse present | 86 | 31 | 7 |
| Widowed, divorced, separated | 2 | 12 | 56 |
| Never married | 12 | 57 | 51 |
| Number of children: | | | |
| None | 32 | 81 | 35 |
| 1-2 | 41 | 15 | 7 |
| Over 2 | 27 | 4 | 3 |
| Highest education level of spouse: | | | |
| No spouse | 13 | 63 | 51 |
| Spouse with five or more years of college | 26 | 23 | 16 |
| Spouse with less schooling | 61 | 14 | 5 |

[1]The data in Table D.1 are U.S. Office of Education estimates based on a probability sample of teaching faculty who taught at least one degree-credit course in spring 1963 and who were employed full time by a United States university or four-year college during the entire academic year 1962-63.

TABLE D.1—Continued

| Characteristics | Percentage | | Percent of Total Who Are Women |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Men (N =113,560) | Women (N =24,642) | |
| Type and size of institution: | | | |
| Universities | 53 | 36 | 13 |
| Public | 34 | 24 | 13 |
| Private | 19 | 12 | 12 |
| 750 faculty or more | 23 | 13 | 11 |
| Less than 750 faculty | 30 | 23 | 14 |
| Colleges | 47 | 64 | 23 |
| Student level taught most: | | | |
| Graduate | 21 | 7 | 7 |
| Lower levels | 79 | 93 | 20 |
| Highest education level: | | | |
| Doctorate | 56 | 27 | 9 |
| Nondoctorate | 44 | 73 | 26 |
| Rank: | | | |
| Professor | 30 | 12 | 8 |
| Associate professor | 25 | 20 | 15 |
| Assistant professor | 28 | 34 | 21 |
| Instructor | 14 | 27 | 29 |
| Other | 3 | 8 | 37 |
| Principal teaching area: | | | |
| Agriculture | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Biological sciences and health fields | 13 | 16 | 21 |
| Business and commerce | 5 | 5 | 17 |
| Education | 7 | 10 | 23 |
| Engineering | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Humanities | 24 | 33 | 24 |
| Law | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Physical education | 3 | 9 | 37 |
| Physical sciences, including mathematics | 16 | 7 | 9 |
| Religion and theology | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| Social sciences, including psychology | 16 | 9 | 11 |
| Home economics | 0 | 8 | 96 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 18 |

was 13 percent, for *private universities* 12 percent, and for *large universities* (750 or more faculty members) 11 percent. Similar figures for high-ranking universities with large graduate student enrollment relative to undergraduate are not available, but we suspect that the figures typically were considerably less than 11 percent. Spring 1969 for The University of Chicago, probably close to that for spring 1963, is 7 percent.

It is likely that the percentage of full-time teaching faculty of universities who were women was not much greater in 1963 than in 1900 and was substantially lower in 1963 than in the early 1930s. We base this judgment on the data in Table D.2, which refer to the faculty and other professional staff in all institutions of higher education in the United States.[2] In the academic year ending in 1900 one-fifth of the faculty and other professional staff in all United States institutions of higher education were women. In the following decade the fraction increased very little, but in the next twenty-two years the proportion increased to almost 29 percent in 1931-32. The ensuing decline, interrupted only during World War II, lasted thirty years and took the fraction to 22 percent in 1961-62. (The percentage rose a few tenths of 1 percent in 1963-64.)

The pool of highly educated persons from which United States universities draw their teaching faculty consists largely of persons who received their graduate training at these institutions. In turn the universities are the major source of employment for the most highly trained portion of this pool. For this reason the ratio of women to men in the increments to university faculty employment is likely to reflect fairly closely the ratio of women to men in the increments to the pool of highly educated persons. In the following pages we present data on the ratio of women to men among United States graduates earning baccalaureate and doctorate degrees, look into some of the factors that have caused the ratio to vary, and speculate about the future course of the ratio.

*Characteristics of Women Faculty*

But first we continue with the characterization of the full-time teaching faculty in United States universities and four-year colleges shown for spring 1963 in Table D.1. The most marked differences between the distributions of the women faculty and those of the men are:

*1. Age.*—Two-thirds of the men, but only half of the women, were thirty to fory years of age. We judge that this difference, most of which occurs in the age interval between thirty and forty years, reflects mainly the lower labor force participation rates of women during childrearing ages than during other years of their lives.

*2. Marital status and number of children.*—86 percent of the men, but only 31 percent of the women, were married with spouse present; 57 percent of the women, but only 12 percent of the men, had never married. It is not surprising then that the proportion of the women faculty who had no children (81 percent) was much higher than the corresponding proportion (32 percent) for the men, while the percent of male faculty with more than two children (27 percent) was markedly greater than that (4 percent) for the female faculty.

[2]The "faculty and other professional staff" include full-time and part-time professional staff engaged in degree-credit and other instruction, administration, student personnel services, library, and organized research in institutions of higher education and in elementary and secondary schools conducted by them. The most recent year for which the data are available by sex is 1963-64. There are no comparable historical series for the full-time teaching faculty of universities.

## TABLE D.2

### Faculty and Other Professional Staff in Institutions of Higher Education, 1900-1964, by Sex

| Year | Total (in Thousands) | Percent Total Who Are Women |
|---|---|---|
| 1899-1900 | 24 | 20% |
| 1909-10 | 36 | 20 |
| 1919-20 | 49 | 26 |
| 1929-30 | 82 | 27 |
| 1931-32 | 101[a] | 29 |
| 1933-34 | 109 | 28 |
| 1935-36 | 121 | 28 |
| 1937-38 | 136 | 28 |
| 1939-40 | 147 | 28 |
| 1941-42 | 151 | 28 |
| 1943-44 | 151 | 30 |
| 1945-46 | 165 | 30 |
| 1947-48 | 224 | 26 |
| 1949-50 | 247 | 25 |
| 1951-52 | 244 | 24 |
| 1953-54 | 266 | 23 |
| 1955-56 | 299 | 23 |
| 1957-58 | 344 | 22 |
| 1959-60[b] | 381 | 22 |
| 1961-62 | 428 | 22 |
| 1963-64 | 498 | 22 |

[a]Full-time equivalents, total number of different persons not tabulated.

[b]First year in which Alaska and Hawaii are included.

*3. Highest education level of spouse.*—Although the husbands of married faculty women had somewhat more schooling on the average than the wives of married faculty men, so large a fraction of the faculty women were without a spouse that a higher fraction (26 percent) of faculty men had a spouse with five or more years of college than was true of faculty women (23 percent).

*4. Type and size of institution.*—53 percent of the men, but only 36 percent of the women, taught in universities. Among those who were employed by universities, 43 percent of the university men and 37 percent of the university women taught at *large* universities (faculty of 750 more).

*5. Student level taught most.*—21 percent of the men, but only 7 percent of the women, taught mainly at the graduate level.

*6. Highest education level.*—More than twice as large a fraction of the men (56 percent) as of the women (27 percent) held an earned degree at the doctorate level.

*7. Rank.*—55 percent of the men, but only 32 percent of the women, held the rank of professor or associate professor, with most of this difference occurring at the professor level. (The discrepancy in rank was even greater in the large universities—63 percent of the men were professors or associate professors, but only 31 percent of the women were. For the private universities the corresponding figures were 58 percent and 31 percent.)

*8. Principal teaching area.*—Although women comprised 18 percent of the full-time teaching faculty, less than 12 percent of those teaching in the areas of agriculture, engineering, law, the physical sciences (including mathematics), religion and theology, and the social sciences (including psychology) were women. On the other hand, in areas of education, the humanities, physical education, and home economics, 23 percent or more of the faculty were women.

In summary, a substantially smaller fraction of the women faculty than of the men faculty were thirty to forty years of age, married (especially with more than two children), in universities (especially large universities), holders of a doctorate level degree, in graduate level teaching, professors or associate professors, in the areas of agriculture, engineering, law, the physical sciences, religion and theology, and the social sciences.

*The Increasing Pool of College-Educated Women*

We turn now to the data on the additions to the pool of highly educated persons. It is apparent that a low female to male ratio in the increments to this pool cannot be accounted for by a low ratio of female to male high school graduates. As recently as 1920 female high school graduates outnumbered male high school graduates by about 50 percent. However, the ratio declined greatly during the 1920s and continued to decline thereafter except during World War II. In 1967-68 males and females graduated from high school in about equal numbers. (In that year the ratio of high school graduates to population eighteen years of age was almost 80 percent.) We speculate that later high school graduating classes will consist almost equally of males and females.

The dropping out of females relative to males begins with enrollment in college following high school graduation. The available data on the ratio of opening fall enrollment of first-time college students to high school graduates are shown in Table D.3. In 1939 over two-fifths of the male high school graduates, but slightly less than one-fourth of the female graduates, enrolled in college.

Thus in that year female graduates were 59 percent as likely as male graduates to enroll in college. Sixteen years later, in 1955, the ratio was even lower—56.7 percent. But since 1955 the fraction of female graduates enrolling in college has risen substantially more than the corresponding fraction for males. In 1968 about half of the female graduates and two-thirds of the male graduates enrolled in college, so that female graduates were 76 percent as likely as male graduates to enter college shortly after high school graduation.

A substantial fraction of the men and perhaps a larger fraction of the women who have enrolled in college drop out before completing a bachelor's or first professional degree—see Table D.4, which shows the ratio of the number of bachelor's and first professional degrees conferred to the first-time degree-credit college enrollment four years earlier. The figures for men in Table D.4 for 1949-51 are surely inflated upwards by the influx of male war verterans who entered college in 1945-47 after World War II. Therefore the implied completion rate for men is overstated for 1949-51 and correspondingly the implied ratio of the completion rate for women to that for men is understated. It appears that apart from this factor, the completion rate for women was declining relative to that for men until 1957-58. Since 1958, however, the completion rate for women has been rising while the rate for men has been declining.

It should be noted that the "first professional" degrees included in Table D.4 (and also in D. 5) include some degrees that typically require five or more years of college study, such as some master's degrees in library science, social work, industrial relations, public administration, and business administration, as well as some other "first professional" degrees that are more nearly master's or doctorates than baccalaureates, such as the M.D., D.D.S., D.D.M., D.V.M., and J.D. Thus it is not really clear from Table D.4 that females do have a lower completion rate than males in four-year bachelor's programs.

Table D.5 provides a somewhat longer historical perspective than Table D.4 on the sex ratio among college graduates at the "baccalaureate" level. In 1900 the ratio was 24 percent—women were only about one-fourth as likely as men to achieve the baccalaureate. The ratio increased rapidly in the next thirty years to 66 percent in 1930, stagnated during the next decade and then, if one neglects the war and immediate postwar years which were quite abnormal, declined to 51 percent in 1958. In the last decade, however, the ratio has increased sharply, reaching 71 percent in 1968.

*Proportions of Women Doctorates*

The great majority of men, and especially women, who achieve a bachelor's or first professional degree do not continue their education to a doctorate. Table D.6 shows that in 1900 there were only 6 percent as many doctorates received by women as by men. The female male ratio tripled in the next twenty years, reaching 18 percent in 1920; stabilized at about 18 percent from 1920 to 1932; and then began a long decline that was broken only briefly during World War II and that reached the minimum figure of 10 percent in 1954. However, if it had not been for the abnormal bunching-up of doctorates awarded to males in the decade following the war, it is likely that the minimum would have occurred later, perhaps in 1958, and would not have been as low as 10 percent. Since 1954 the doctorate sex ratio has risen substantially, reaching 14 percent in 1968. (Data on the ratio of doctorates to baccalaureates and the ratio of doctorates to total population aged twenty to twenty-four, data not shown here, convey essentially the same message.)

## TABLE D.3

Percent of High School Graduates Who Entered College, 1939-68, by Sex

| Year | Men | Women | Percent Women of Men |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1939 | 41% | 25% | 59% |
| 1950 | 56 | 31 | 56 |
| 1955 | 64 | 37 | 57 |
| 1960 | 60 | 40 | 66 |
| 1965 | 64 | 46 | 72 |
| 1966 | 59 | 44 | 74 |
| 1967 | 61 | 46 | 76 |
| 1968 | 68 | 51 | 76 |

## TABLE D.4

Percent Who Completed B.A. and First Professional Degrees, 1949-50 to 1967-68, by Sex[a]

| Year | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| 1949-50 | 66% | 53% |
| 1950-51 | 70 | 54 |
| 1951-52 | 61 | 53 |
| 1952-53 | 56 | 52 |
| 1953-54 | 59 | 53 |
| 1954-55 | 66 | 54 |
| 1955-56 | 62 | 52 |
| 1956-57 | 65 | 52 |
| 1957-58 | 63 | 50 |
| 1958-59 | 61 | 51 |
| 1959-60 | 57 | 50 |
| 1960-61 | 57 | 51 |
| 1961-62 | 56 | 51 |
| 1962-63 | 56 | 52 |
| 1963-64 | 55 | 52 |
| 1964-65 | 54 | 51 |
| 1965-66 | 55 | 51 |
| 1966-67 | 58 | 54 |
| 1967-68 | 56 | 53 |

[a]Ratio of bachelor's and first professional degrees conferred to first-time degree credit enrollment four years earlier.

## TABLE D.5

### Earned B.A. and First Professional Degrees, 1900-1968, by Sex

| Year | Total (in Thousands) | Percent Women of Men |
|---|---|---|
| 1900 | 27 | 24% |
| 1910 | 37 | 29 |
| 1920 | 49 | 52 |
| 1930 | 122 | 66 |
| 1932 | 138 | 66 |
| 1934 | 136 | 65 |
| 1936 | 143 | 66 |
| 1938 | 165 | 69 |
| 1940 | 186 | 70 |
| 1942 | 185 | 78 |
| 1944 | 126 | 125 |
| 1946 | 136 | 132 |
| 1948 | 272 | 55 |
| 1950 | 434 | 32 |
| 1952 | 332 | 46 |
| 1954 | 293 | 56 |
| 1956 | 311 | 56 |
| 1958 | 366 | 51 |
| 1960 | 395 | 55 |
| 1962 | 420 | 60 |
| 1964 | 502 | 67 |
| 1966 | 556 | 68 |
| 1968 | 672 | 71 |

## TABLE D.6

Earned Doctorates Conferred, 1900-1968, by Sex

| Year | Total | Percent Women of Men |
|---|---|---|
| 1900 | 382 | 6% |
| 1910 | 443 | 11 |
| 1920 | 615 | 18 |
| 1930 | 2,299 | 18 |
| 1932 | 2,654 | 18 |
| 1934 | 2,830 | 15 |
| 1936 | 2,770 | 17 |
| 1938 | 2,932 | 17 |
| 1940 | 3,290 | 15 |
| 1942 | 3,497 | 15 |
| 1944 | 2,305 | 23 |
| 1946 | 1,966 | 24 |
| 1948 | 3,989 | 14 |
| 1950 | 6,420 | 11 |
| 1952 | 7,683 | 10 |
| 1954 | 8,996 | 10 |
| 1956 | 8,903 | 11 |
| 1958 | 8,942 | 12 |
| 1960 | 9,829 | 12 |
| 1962 | 11,622 | 12 |
| 1964 | 14,490 | 12 |
| 1966 | 18,239 | 13 |
| 1968 | 23,091 | 14 |

Why is it that during the last seventy years and more (except during and after World War II) each doctorate degree cohort contained less than one-fifth as many women as men? And why has the ratio of women to men in the doctorate cohorts varied so much historically in the United States?

*The Returns from Graduate Education*

It is a costly investment to extend one's education beyond the high school level to the baccalaureate, the master's, and then the doctorate. The cost includes not only tuition and fees but also the benefits one foregoes by using time in educational activity rather than in labor market activity or other nonschool activity. These costs are probably roughly the same for a man as for a woman.

Presumably individuals are moved to undertake such large investments by the prospect that the investments will yield large returns during the rest of their lives in the form of increased productivity or capacity in market or nonmarket activities or both. Higher education in general, especially graduate education, tends to be much more specialized than lower levels of education in terms of the range of activities for which the education increases a person's productive capacity. In particular, graduate education increases an individual's capacity much less in nonmarket activities than in market activities. Thus the larger the fraction of his lifetime a person expects to spend in nonmarket activities (e.g., household and other activities that do not demand heavy use of his specialized capacity), the lower will tend to be the return he can expect to receive from his graduate education.

Fields of graduate education of course differ with respect to the range of activities for which they yield a substantial increment of capacity. We shall say more about this aspect later. However, we wish to emphasize here that graduate education tends to increase capacity for household tasks less than for some other fairly narrow ranges of tasks in the marketplace.

This aspect of graduate education would not have led women generally to choose somewhat different life patterns from those of men (including the type of education pattern) were it not that men and women, and their parents and grandparents before them, have acted as if the comparative advantage of the wife in a husband-wife pair was in the household, while that of the husband was in the market. Indeed, because parents have acted this way with their children, they have commonly prepared daughters better than sons for the performance of household tasks.

What is relevant here is not the *absolute* capacity of women compared to that of men, but the *relative* capacity—in household activities relative to market activities—of women compared to the *relative* capacity of men. Thus it is not surprising for the wife of a husband-wife pair to spend a larger fraction of her life in the household than does the husband, even though she may be absolutely more capable than he in the market, for her relative capacity in the household is greater than his.

*Family Status, Education, and Labor Force Participation*

Hence a man who chooses a life pattern that includes advanced education, dedication

to a career for which this education prepares him, marriage, children, and with spouse caring for household and children can more easily find a compatible spouse than can a woman who is his equal in terms of market qualifications. Relatively fewer women than men in each population cohort will choose such a life pattern, including its education component. Thus, as we have seen in earlier tables, cohorts of persons completing the bachelor's degree, the master's, and the doctorate have tended to consist disproportionately of men. Furthermore, the women who do choose to have an advanced education will tend: 1) to marry relatively less frequently than their male counterparts, and when married to have fewer children, and 2) to participate in larger proportion in the labor force than less educated women.

The last proposition is confirmed by data from the 1950 and 1960 population censuses. At each educational level (with one exception in 1960) married women with husband present had lower labor force participation rates than women in other marital statuses, and lower still if they had young children. No matter what their family status, however, labor force participation rates for women increased sharply with educational level.

Among women who had completed five or more years of college in 1960 almost a third of those married with husband and young children present, almost two-thirds of those married with husband but no young children, almost three-fourths of the women in other marital status with young children, and over four-fifths of those in other marital status without young children were in the labor force. Undoubtedly, in each of the family status categories the women who held the doctorate in 1960 had even higher labor force participation rates. The census does not provide the figures. However, a survey of 1,547 women who received their doctorates in 1957 and 1958 showed that 91 percent were in the labor force in December 1965.[3] Women generally spend a smaller fraction of their lives in the labor force than do men, but the sex difference in labor force participation is not great among persons with doctorate level education.

*Fields of Graduate Study*

We mentioned earlier that fields of graduate specialization probably differ in the extent to which they increase capacity in market relative to nonmarket activities. Since women with doctorate level education generally spend on the average a smaller fraction of their lives in market activities than do men doctorates, it is reasonable for women to choose to specialize relatively more than men in the fields that are more general—i.e., relatively less specialized to the market.

Table D.7 shows the percentage distribution of earned doctorates, 1920-68, by broad field and by sex. The table confirms that there have been substantial differences between men and women in their choice of doctorate specialty. In the period since 1950 women have earned 10 to 14 percent as many doctorates as men. Yet in the physical sciences in this period only about 3 percent of the doctorates went to women, while in education 18 to 26 percent and in the arts and professions 22 to 24 percent went to women. Broadly speaking these sex differences among the fields correspond to those in Table D.1 for the full-time teaching faculty.

[3]Astin, "Factors Associated with the Participation of Women Doctorates in the Labor Force," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, November 1967. The estimated participation rate, 91 percent, is probably an overestimate because of nonresponse bias in the survey of women doctorates.

Table D.8 shows the distribution of doctorates by sex in much more detail by field than Table D.7 for the academic years 1957-58 and 1967-68. The fields—excluding those that granted less than one hundred doctorates in 1967-68—ranked as shown in Table D.9 in terms of the ratio of women to men doctorates. Education and all of the humanities fields except philosophy were in the top half by rank in both 1957-58 and 1967-68. The five physical science fields ranked low in both years, along with religion and business. The social sciences and the biological sciences were more dispersed in rank. In the social sciences, psychology, sociology, and anthropology ranked in the top half of the fields of Table D.9, history in the middle, and political science and economics in the bottom half. Similarly in the biological sciences, biology, biochemistry, bacteriology, etc., and physiology were in the upper half while pharmacology and genetics were in the bottom half.

We turn now to the second of the questions we asked earlier: Why has the ratio of women to men in doctorate cohorts varied so much historically in the United States? We have only a very incomplete answer to this question. The factors that have caused the doctorate sex ratio to vary, we think, are the same factors in the main that have caused the marriage rate, the birth rate, and the female labor force participation rate to vary. That is, we view the choices that a woman makes with respect to her schooling, marriage, number of children, and the allocation of her time between home and labor force as a set of interrelated choices.

The labor force participation rate for women (fourteen years of age and over) has risen quite steadily and with few substantial declines from about 20 percent in 1900 to about 40 percent in 1968. The major factors accounting for this large shift in the allocation of the time of women between the home and the market are the large increases in market real wages, which were at least as great as the corresponding increases for men, and the declines in the prices of market substitutes for household-produced commodities relative to the costs of production of these commodities in the household. For example, there has been a large displacement of food preparation in the household by food preparation on the market and the rise in real wages has induced the substitution of household appliances for labor in the household.

These price and wage trends have been so persistent that it is hard to believe that they will not continue and carry the labor force participation rate of women with them. This leads us to conjecture that in the future the working lives of men and women will increasingly resemble each other.

Nevertheless we are somewhat hesitant about predicting a more or less *steady* upward trend in the ratio of women to men doctorates. During the same period, 1900-1968, in which the labor force participation rate for women doubled, the ratio of women to men doctorates conferred went from 6 percent to 14 percent, more than doubling. Yet the increase from 6 to 14 percent was by no means a steady one; there were large swings around this "trend." Indeed, the ratio in 1968 (14 percent) was smaller than it had been throughout the period from 1920 to 1946.

We think it is not simply a coincidence that the large movements about the trend in the ratio of women to men doctorates (with exception of the movement induced by the military draft in World War II and the subsequent bunching of males enrolled in universities and colleges) are, broadly speaking, the reverse of those in the U.S. birth rate. The number of births per one thousand native white women fifteen to forty-four years of age declined from 130 in 1900 to 74 in 1933, increased to 118 in 1957, and then declined to 83 a decade later. We think that the

TABLE D.7

Earned Doctorates by Field and by Sex, 1920-68

| Field and Sex | 1920 | 1930 | 1940 | 1950 | 1960 | 1968 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Present distribution among fields: | | | | | | |
| Physical sciences | 27 | 29 | 29 | 34 | 30 | 32 |
| Biological sciences | 24 | 18 | 22 | 17 | 18 | 16 |
| Social sciences | 20 | 21 | 18 | 19 | 21 | 18 |
| Arts and professions | 20 | 18 | 16 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| Education | 9 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 16 | 18 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Percent Women of Men: | | | | | | |
| Physical sciences | 12 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 2.6 | 3.5 |
| Biological sciences | 23 | 21 | 14 | 11 | 9 | 15 |
| Social sciences | 25 | 18 | 16 | 11 | 15 | 18 |
| Arts and professions | 20 | 31 | 25 | 22 | 22 | 24 |
| Education | 20 | 23 | 26 | 18 | 25 | 26 |
| All fields | 19 | 18 | 15 | 10 | 12 | 14 |

TABLE D.8

Earned Doctorates in Selected Fields of Study

1957-58 and 1967-68, by Sex

| Field of Study | 1957-58 | | 1967-68 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Anatomy, histology | 24 | 11 | 73 | 21 |
| Biochemistry | 132 | 17 | 343 | 99 |
| Biology, general | 103 | 27 | 242 | 72 |
| Biophysics | 14 | 1 | 76 | 5 |
| Pharmacology | 36 | 2 | 172 | 21 |
| Physiology | 63 | 10 | 151 | 31 |
| Genetics | 49 | 4 | 94 | 10 |
| Bacteriology, virology, mycology, parasitology, microbiology | 137 | 23 | 253 | 52 |
| Clinical medical sciences | 38 | 2 | 36 | 2 |
| Pathology | 14 | 2 | 48 | 1 |
| Education | 1,297 | 341 | 3,249 | 830 |

TABLE D.8—Continued

| Field of Study | 1957-58 | | 1967-68 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Geography | 47 | 9 | 94 | 2 |
| Psychology | 488 | 84 | 982 | 286 |
| American culture, civilization | 13 | 3 | 32 | 6 |
| Anthropology | 42 | 9 | 105 | 33 |
| Area or regional studies | 27 | 0 | 61 | 9 |
| Economics | 234 | 5 | 565 | 35 |
| History | 265 | 32 | 598 | 90 |
| International relations | 20 | 3 | 72 | 4 |
| Political science | 164 | 6 | 405 | 52 |
| Sociology | 122 | 28 | 299 | 68 |
| Computer science and systems analysis | — | — | 36 | 0 |
| Mathematics | 196 | 14 | 774 | 50 |
| Statistics | 36 | 1 | 121 | 2 |
| Astronomy | 18 | 4 | 78 | 9 |
| Chemistry | 890 | 49 | 1,584 | 139 |
| Physics | 455 | 9 | 1,234 | 26 |
| Earth sciences: | | | | |
| Geology | 133 | 3 | 240 | 6 |
| Geophysics | 15 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Oceanography | 13 | 0 | 39 | 1 |
| Other | 3 | 0 | 35 | 1 |
| Music | 68 | 6 | 158 | 27 |
| Linguistics | 22 | 8 | 77 | 20 |
| Latin or classical Greek | 17 | 5 | 63 | 26 |
| Germanic languages and literatures | 31 | 11 | 96 | 30 |
| Romance languages and literatures | 61 | 35 | 214 | 113 |
| English language and literature | 280 | 53 | 717 | 260 |
| Philosophy | 97 | 5 | 251 | 27 |
| Slavic languages and literatures | 3 | 1 | 20 | 10 |
| Other languages and literatures | 25 | 5 | 32 | 3 |
| Business and commerce | 104 | 5 | 431 | 14 |
| Law | 32 | 0 | 34 | 2 |
| Library science | 13 | 6 | 15 | 7 |
| Religion | 276 | 14 | 382 | 19 |
| Social work | 12 | 6 | 60 | 17 |

factors that caused the birth rate to depart from its *downward* trend during the period from 1933 to 1957 also were the major factors that caused the ratio of women to men doctorates to depart from its *upward* trend for roughly the same period. Since we do not know what these factors are, we cannot predict with confidence that the upward trend in the doctorate sex ratio will not be broken again by somewhat prolonged reverse movement.

TABLE D.9

Subject Matter Fields Ranked by Ratio of Female to Male Doctorates

| Field | Ratio of Female to Male Doctorates | | Rank | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1967-68 | 1957-58 | 1967-68 | 1957-58 |
| Romance languages and literatures | 53 | 57 | 1 | 1 |
| English language and literature | 36 | 19 | 2 | 7 |
| Anthropology | 31 | 21 | 3 | 6 |
| Germanic languages and literatures | 31 | 35 | 4 | 2 |
| Biology, general | 30 | 26 | 5 | 4 |
| Psychology | 29 | 17 | 6 | 8 |
| Biochemistry | 29 | 13 | 7 | 11 |
| Education | 26 | 26 | 8 | 3 |
| Sociology | 23 | 23 | 9 | 5 |
| Bacteriology, virology, etc. | 21 | 17 | 10 | 9 |
| Physiology | 21 | 16 | 11 | 10 |
| Music | 17 | 9 | 12 | 13 |
| Pharmacology | 17 | 6 | 13 | 16 |
| History | 15 | 12 | 14 | 12 |
| Political science | 13 | 4 | 15 | 21 |
| Philosophy | 11 | 5 | 16 | 18 |
| Genetics | 11 | 8 | 17 | 14 |
| Chemistry | 9 | 6 | 18 | 17 |
| Mathematics | 6 | 7 | 19 | 15 |
| Economics | 6 | 2 | 20 | 24 |
| Religion | 5 | 5 | 21 | 19 |
| Business and commerce | 3 | 5 | 22 | 20 |
| Geology | 2 | 2 | 23 | 23 |
| Physics | 2 | 2 | 24 | 25 |
| Statistics | 2 | 3 | 25 | 22 |

81

# APPENDIX E

## THE STUDENT SURVEY

This appendix contains the questionnaire used in the sample survey of students in the University carried out in Autumn Quarter 1969 as part of our investigations. Following each question is the percentage distribution of responses, separately for men and women. Also included in this appendix is a table giving the highest degree expected by respondents, separately for men and women in the various academic units.

### *Sample and Weighting*

*The sample.*—The sample was drawn so that there would be an expected sample size of fifty men and fifty women respondents from each of the graduate divisions, undergraduate divisions, and professional schools. If less than fifty women were registered in the unit, all registered women were sampled. Equal sample sizes were drawn so that men-women comparisons within units could be made.

Alphabetical lists of students registered in Spring Quarter 1969 were obtained from the academic units. In some cases students who were not returning for Autumn Quarter were indicated by the unit, and these were removed from the list. In the other units we oversampled, assuming a loss rate of 30 percent, primarily resulting from completion of a degree. The sampling intervals were then determined individually for each unit and sex, and the sample was drawn by selecting every $n^{th}$ name on the list.

*Weighting.*—Respondents have been weighted so that they represent their proper proportion in the University. Suppose, to use a hypothetical example, we had fifty women business school respondents and that they made up 10 percent of our total sample, but that women business school students constitute only 1 percent of the University student body. When we are looking at some characteristic for the University as a whole, these women would be weighted down so that they are 1 percent of the total.

### *Operational Procedures*

The instrument used in carrying out this research was a twenty page self-administered questionnaire. With few exceptions the questions had precoded answers from which the respondent picked one or more. The questionnaire took about twenty minutes to complete.

The first page of the questionnaire was a cover letter. Respondents were instructed to complete the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it to the place provided at registration or to send it back through faculty exchange. Attached to the questionnaire was a card on which the student was to fill in his or her name and division. This card was to be returned separately from the questionnaire when the questionnaire was completed. When a card was received, the respondent's name was removed from the sample list. In this way the anonymity of respondents was assured. At the same time we were able to identify those who had not returned their questionnaires and to follow up with phone calls.

*Distribution of the Questionnaire*

Budget and time limitations made it imperative that the questionnaire be distributed as soon as possible after students arrived on campus to begin Autumn Quarter. Since current addresses would not be available until well into Autumn Quarter, it was thought that registration was the only feasible time for distribution.

There were considerable difficulties in getting proper distribution of questionnaires to sample respondents during the registration period. These difficulties were apparently a major cause of the low response rate in some units.

In those units which gave us full cooperation during registration, the response rates were near 90 percent. Because of the number of sample respondents missed at registration, well over a month was spent by workers locating, for the first time, approximately 50 percent of those in the sample, as well as following up on those who had not immediately responded.

*Response Rates*

The overall response rate was 77 percent. The response rates for men and women were 78 percent and 75 percent respectively. There was a wide range in response rates in the various units—from a high of 95 percent among women in the business and law schools to a low of 62 percent among undergraduate women in the social sciences. Some of the variation undoubtedly resulted from differences in methods of distribution and follow-up. Also, there is some evidence that a women's group boycotted the questionnaire. Members of this group tend to be in the undergraduate social sciences division where we had our lowest response rate. While the same distribution and follow-up methods were used, 81 percent of the social science undergraduate men as compared with 62 percent of the women responded—a difference of 19 percentage points. Therefore, we caution that there may be some systematic bias due to nonresponse. Some proportion of the women in our sample appear to have been nonrespondents for political reasons.

## Summary of Responses of Student Questionnaire

1. Number of respondents[a]

| | Actual | Weighted |
|---|---|---|
| Men | 587 | 776 |
| Women | 472 | 335 |
| Total | 1,059 | 1,111 |

2. Number of respondents by academic unit:

| | Actual | | Weighted | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| *College* | | | | |
| Biology | 32 | 38 | 31 | 18 |
| Physical Sciences | 43 | 29 | 54 | 13 |
| Social Sciences | 58 | 39 | 93 | 55 |
| Humanities | 31 | 35 | 49 | 60 |
| New Collegiate Division | 34 | 24 | 15 | 11 |
| *Graduate Divisions* | | | | |
| Biological Sciences | 45 | 42 | 21 | 10 |
| Physical Sciences | 49 | 35 | 95 | 8 |
| Social Sciences | 48 | 41 | 118 | 51 |
| Humanities | 32 | 34 | 58 | 40 |
| *Professional Schools* | | | | |
| Business | 49 | 18 | 72 | 5 |
| Divinity | 38 | 18 | 61 | 7 |
| Education (M.A.T and M.S.T.) | 15 | 14 | 4 | 11 |
| Law | 39 | 35 | 47 | 7 |
| Library | 9 | 28 | 5 | 8 |
| Medicine | 29 | 14 | 36 | 4 |
| Social Service | 36 | 28 | 17 | 27 |
| Total | 587 | 472 | 776 | 335 |

3A. As of this fall, how many years have you been at The University of Chicago?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| 1 year or less | 33.2 | 40.4 |
| 2 years | 28.5 | 26.5 |
| 3 years | 22.2 | 21.4 |
| 4 years | 7.6 | 5.3 |
| More than 4 years | 8.5 | 6.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[a]There were seventy-four completed questionnaires (forty-four men and thirty women) which did not indicate academic unit. These respondents have been omitted from these tables because weights could not be determined for them.

| | | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3B. | Are you a graduate student, or are you an undergraduate? | | |
| | Graduate | 69% | 53.4% |
| | Undergraduate | 31 | 46.6 |
| | Total | 100[a] | 100.0 |
| 4. | Marital Status: | | |
| | Married | 35.5% | 24.8% |
| | Single | 59.8 | 60.7 |
| | Separated | .5 | .5 |
| | Divorced | .7 | 1.9 |
| | Widowed | .0 | .1 |
| | Not married, but have plans | 3.5 | 12.0 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 4A. | If married, what will your spouse be doing this academic year? | | |
| | Employed | 55.0% | 44.6% |
| | Employed and school | 7.0 | 18.8 |
| | School | 18.0 | 36.5 |
| | Housewife | 19.0 | .0 |
| | Other | 2.0 | .0 |
| | Total | 101.0 | 99.9 |
| 4B. | How many children do you now have? | | |
| | Percent with children | 32.8% | 19.0% |
| | Percent with children under six years | 27.7 | 7.8 |
| 5. | Age:_____ | | |
| 6A. | Are you employed? (last academic year) | | |
| | Yes | 42.6% | 47.5% |
| | No | 57.4 | 52.5 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| | If yes: | | |
| 6B. | Did a faculty member at the University help you get the job? | | |
| | Yes | 35.5% | 30.5% |
| | No | 64.5 | 69.5 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 6C. | Is the job relevant to your field? | | |
| | Yes | 64.4% | 49.3% |
| | No | 35.6 | 50.7 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[a]The remaining figures in this appendix are percentages. No answers and not applicable responses are not included in the percentage base in these figures.

7. How would you say the following affect your academic work?

| | | Very Favorably | More Favorably than Unfavorably | Not At All | More Unfavorably than Favorably | Very Unfavorably |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (A) Marriage or committed relationship | M..... | 43.0 | 38.9 | 10.6 | 7.0 | .4 |
| | W..... | 40.3 | 39.5 | 12.8 | 5.6 | 1.7 |
| (B) Children | M..... | 16.0 | 26.8 | 24.2 | 32.5 | .5 |
| | W..... | 0.0 | 31.5 | 1.6 | 51.9 | 14.9 |
| (C) Job | M..... | 16.1 | 27.1 | 18.9 | 32.1 | 5.8 |
| | W..... | 7.2 | 33.7 | 24.0 | 28.0 | 7.1 |

8. Will you be receiving money from the following sources this academic year?

| | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Fellowship or scholarship..... | 71.4 | 65.9 | 28.6 | 34.1 |
| Loan..... | 28.7 | 26.4 | 71.3 | 73.6 |
| Parents..... | 45.5 | 49.0 | 54.5 | 51.0 |
| Spouse's job..... | 19.8 | 13.7 | 80.2 | 86.3 |
| Own job..... | 54.4 | 56.7 | 45.6 | 43.3 |

9. Was The University of Chicago your first choice for:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| College..... | 63.1 | 68.3 | 36.9 | 31.7 |
| Graduate school..... | 76.1 | 84.5 | 23.9 | 15.5 |

10. Do you belong to any women's groups (e.g., WRAP, NOW, WITCH, women's caucuses)?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| N/A | 5.0 | N/A | 95.0 |

11. What is the highest grade of school your mother and father completed?

| | Father | | Mother | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Eight years or less..... | 9.8 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 3.3 |
| Some high school..... | 9.2 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 8.7 |
| High school graduate..... | 19.6 | 14.2 | 32.2 | 23.7 |
| Some college..... | 16.4 | 20.0 | 18.5 | 24.2 |
| College graduate..... | 13.3 | 12.7 | 17.3 | 18.5 |
| Some graduate or professional school..... | 4.9 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 8.4 |
| Graduate or professional degree..... | 26.8 | 30.3 | 9.0 | 13.2 |
| Total..... | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.9 | 100.0 |

12. Thinking back to your high school years, please indicate your father's and mother's occupations and approximate annual income.

| | Father | | Mother | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (A) Occupation | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Professional | 41.1 | 46.1 | 16.0 | 17.6 |
| Proprietor or manager | 21.0 | 21.3 | 1.8 | 2.9 |
| Sales (other than sales manager or administrator) | 7.9 | 7.7 | 2.5 | 2.2 |
| Clerical | 4.1 | 2.6 | 12.9 | 17.0 |
| Skilled worker | 12.9 | 11.8 | 3.1 | 3.5 |
| Semi-skilled worker | 4.2 | 4.4 | 2.3 | 0.9 |
| Service worker | 2.9 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 1.5 |
| Unskilled worker | 3.2 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.9 |
| Farmer or farm worker | 2.3 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Not employed | 0.2 | 1.0 | 54.8 | 52.5 |
| Total | 99.8 | 100.1 | 99.9 | 100.0 |
| (B) Income (estimate) | | | | |
| Less than $5,000 | 9.7 | 6.6 | 50.9 | 43.9 |
| $5,000—$9,999 | 34.5 | 33.9 | 42.5 | 44.4 |
| $10,000—$14,999 | 25.5 | 23.4 | 4.4 | 10.1 |
| $15,000—$19,999 | 10.1 | 14.1 | 0.5 | 1.0 |
| $20,000—$29,999 | 10.7 | 10.9 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| $30,000 and up | 9.5 | 11.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.9 |

13. Was your mother employed at all for each of these time periods? When you were:

| | | Mother Employed Full Time | Mother Employed Part Time | Mother Not Employed | Don't Remember |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (A) 5 years or younger | M | 7.7 | 8.6 | 78.3 | 5.3 |
| | W | 8.9 | 10.3 | 77.7 | 3.0 |
| (B) 6-10 years | M | 12.8 | 14.5 | 71.6 | 1.1 |
| | W | 16.2 | 11.0 | 70.6 | 2.2 |
| (C) 11-15 years | M | 21.0 | 19.4 | 59.0 | 0.7 |
| | W | 24.1 | 17.6 | 57.7 | 0.6 |
| (D) 16+ | M | 34.0 | 20.9 | 45.1 | 0.0 |
| | W | 34.6 | 16.8 | 48.6 | 0.0 |

14A. If your mother did work at any of these times,
(1) How did your mother feel about working?
(2) How did your father feel about it?
(3) You as a child?

| | (1) Mother's Attitude | | (2) Father's Feelings | | (3) Your Attitude | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Very positive | 44.9 | 46.4 | 28.0 | 32.9 | 20.5 | 29.0 |
| Mildly positive | 32.1 | 32.7 | 32.6 | 37.1 | 34.8 | 30.2 |
| Mildly negative | 10.6 | 9.8 | 15.8 | 8.4 | 15.4 | 17.4 |
| Very negative | 4.3 | 3.3 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 5.6 | 2.6 |
| Don't know | 8.0 | 7.8 | 18.2 | 16.4 | 23.7 | 20.8 |
| Total | 99.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

14B. If your mother did not work, do you remember your mother ever expressing . . .

| | | Frequently | Occasionally | Rarely | Never |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A desire to work | M | 0.9 | 24.8 | 26.7 | 47.6 |
| | W | 0.9 | 26.8 | 22.8 | 49.5 |
| Dissatisfaction with her housewife role | M | 3.0 | 17.9 | 32.9 | 46.2 |
| | W | 5.4 | 27.4 | 20.0 | 47.2 |

15. What is the highest degree you expect to hold, what is the highest degree you now hold, and what is the next degree you expect to receive?

| | | Bachelor's (B.A., B.S., etc.) | Master's (M.A., M.S., etc.) | Ph.D. or Ed. D. | LL.B. or J.D. | M.D. | Other | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Highest degree expect to hold | M | 2.4 | 17.0 | 61.6 | 10.4 | 7.9 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| | W | 3.5 | 32.1 | 54.4 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Highest degree now hold | M | 39.2 | 28.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | .6 | 0.1 | 31.4 |
| | W | 33.2 | 19.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 | .1 | 0.1 | 47.0 |
| Next degree expect to hold | M | 31.3 | 24.5 | 33.0 | 5.7 | 5.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| | W | 44.9 | 29.1 | 21.3 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 |

16. What is your grade point average at The University of Chicago?

| | | A | A− | B+ | B | B− | C+ | C | C− | Less than C− | No Grades Given |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| College | M | 5.4 | 8.0 | 25.1 | 17.4 | 17.7 | 13.4 | 6.8 | 4.6 | 1.3 | 0.4 |
| | W | 0.3 | 7.9 | 21.5 | 17.4 | 22.9 | 22.7 | 4.7 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 0.3 |
| Graduate school | M | 6.8 | 20.1 | 31.6 | 22.1 | 7.0 | 3.9 | 1.2 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 7.4 |
| | W | 9.1 | 24.9 | 32.2 | 20.0 | 5.5 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 3.5 |

17. How many courses did you take last academic year?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1.1 | .3 |
| 1 | .8 | .5 |
| 2 | .1 | .7 |
| 3 | 8.7 | 5.4 |
| 4 | 6.0 | 10.3 |
| 5 | .3 | .6 |
| 6 | 3.9 | 2.8 |
| 7 | 2.1 | .8 |
| 8 | 2.8 | 2.7 |
| 9 | 27.2 | 21.2 |
| 10 | 10.2 | 9.1 |
| 11 | 10.6 | 16.1 |
| 12 | 23.2 | 22.8 |
| More than 12 | 3.1 | 6.9 |
| Total | 100.1 | 100.0 |

18. How many Incompletes did you carry over one quarter last academic year?

| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| M | 70.6 | 17.9 | 7.5 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| W | 66.5 | 22.4 | 8.6 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |

19. How many R's did you take last academic year?

| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| M | 79.8 | 11.8 | 4.4 | 2.8 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| W | 73.7 | 14.9 | 5.7 | 2.8 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.4 |

20. Following are some of the reasons that people give for being in college and graduate school. Which would you say are important in your being in school?

| | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| I really enjoy it | 69.8 | 79.1 | 30.2 | 20.9 |
| I don't have anything better to do | 24.0 | 30.1 | 76.0 | 69.9 |
| I need a degree to do the kind of work I want to do | 84.2 | 89.4 | 15.8 | 10.6 |
| I want to keep my student deferment | 31.6 | 0.0 | 68.4 | 0.0 |
| My family pressured me to | 12.0 | 9.7 | 88.0 | 90.3 |
| Other | 13.3 | 14.9 | 86.7 | 85.1 |

21. How do you think these people feel about your going to (being in) graduate or professional school?

| | | Very Favorable | Somewhat Favorable | Not Too Favorable | Don't Know |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yourself | M..... | 66.9 | 24.1 | 6.1 | 2.9 |
| | W..... | 67.6 | 23.1 | 4.1 | 5.2 |
| Father | M..... | 74.6 | 18.7 | 4.6 | 2.0 |
| | W..... | 66.8 | 19.4 | 7.4 | 6.4 |
| Mother | M..... | 77.7 | 19.1 | 2.4 | 0.9 |
| | W..... | 62.0 | 27.4 | 5.8 | 4.8 |
| Siblings | M..... | 58.3 | 26.7 | 1.9 | 13.1 |
| | W..... | 44.7 | 26.2 | 4.0 | 25.1 |
| Other relatives | M..... | 55.2 | 23.5 | 3.4 | 17.9 |
| | W..... | 37.5 | 24.6 | 7.9 | 30.0 |
| Most friends of opposite sex | M..... | 51.4 | 28.5 | 1.4 | 18.7 |
| | W..... | 40.0 | 33.1 | 6.3 | 20.6 |
| Most friends of same sex | M..... | 51.1 | 29.8 | 2.8 | 16.3 |
| | W..... | 46.9 | 33.3 | 4.5 | 15.3 |
| Spouse, boy friend or girl friend | M..... | 64.5 | 26.4 | 2.7 | 6.5 |
| | W..... | 62.8 | 23.4 | 6.0 | 7.8 |
| Male faculty member | M..... | 46.7 | 20.0 | 2.1 | 31.3 |
| | W..... | 32.2 | 22.8 | 5.2 | 39.8 |
| Female faculty member | M..... | 37.1 | 15.8 | 0.9 | 46.2 |
| | W..... | 34.8 | 12.7 | 1.0 | 51.4 |
| Any significant older people | M..... | 56.2 | 19.1 | 1.4 | 23.3 |
| | W..... | 44.9 | 21.1 | 3.3 | 30.8 |

Questions 22 and 23 for undergraduates only.

22. If you were to attend graduate school, which of the following general fields do you think you would probably go into?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Physical science | 15.9 | 6.2 |
| Biological science | 5.5 | 6.1 |
| Education | 4.0 | 6.0 |
| Library science | 0.0 | 2.6 |
| Social science | 18.5 | 23.7 |
| Creative arts | 2.0 | 2.3 |
| Humanities | 17.1 | 21.7 |
| Medicine | 10.7 | 6.4 |
| Other health professions | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Business | 2.5 | 1.9 |
| Law | 11.8 | 8.8 |
| Social work | 0.0 | 2.8 |
| Divinity | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Engineering | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| City planning or architecture | 2.0 | 0.3 |
| Journalism | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 2.8 | 3.4 |
| Don't know | 2.7 | 5.5 |
| Total | 99.9 | 100.0 |

23. Do you plan to go to graduate school:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Immediately after graduation | 53.4 | 34.1 |
| 2. After some time off | 18.5 | 31.2 |
| 3. Not at all | 3.2 | 2.1 |
| 4. Haven't decided | 24.9 | 32.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

(A) If answered 2, 3, or 4 above: Which of the following best describes the one most important factor in your not going to graduate school?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Want to get practical experience first | 3.7 | 11.4 |
| Financial obstacles | 10.3 | 10.8 |
| Family responsibilities | 0.0 | 3.5 |
| Don't need it for the kind of work I plan to do | 5.1 | 1.8 |
| Military service | 7.2 | 0.0 |
| Have been told by faculty that I won't be able to make it through | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| I don't think I have the ability | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| I'm tired of being a student | 23.1 | 27.7 |
| Education obtained in grad school is irrelevant to my goals | 8.0 | 3.9 |
| Time to think things over | 18.7 | 26.0 |
| Peace Corps, VISTA | 9.9 | 5.1 |
| Other | 11.5 | 7.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.1 |

Questions 24-27 for graduates only.

24. To the best of your knowledge, how do graduates of your department or professional school obtain jobs when they have completed their education?

| | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Through their own efforts | 81.0 | 84.8 | 19.0 | 15.2 |
| Through a central clearinghouse | 38.3 | 33.4 | 61.7 | 66.6 |
| Through individual contacts by professors | 67.5 | 70.3 | 32.5 | 29.7 |
| Through friends and relatives | 25.0 | 22.8 | 75.0 | 77.2 |
| Other | 13.4 | 12.4 | 86.6 | 87.6 |

25. Since you came to The University of Chicago has a faculty member asked you for any of the following information?

| | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Marital status or plans | 45.3 | 43.3 | 54.7 | 56.7 |
| How many childen you have | 24.4 | 19.8 | 75.6 | 80.2 |
| How many children you plan to have | 3.4 | 3.5 | 96.6 | 96.5 |
| When you plan to have a/another child | 3.4 | 5.8 | 96.9 | 94.2 |
| How you plan to arrange for the care of your child/children while you are a student | 3.1 | 6.7 | 96.9 | 93.3 |

If yes to any of the above: Did it bother you that these questions were asked?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 5.9 | 14.9 |
| No | 94.1 | 85.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

26. When did you decide to go to graduate school in the field you are now in?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Before college | 16.6 | 6.3 |
| During college | 51.4 | 55.9 |
| During time out of school after college | 21.2 | 28.2 |
| During or after graduate work in another field | 10.7 | 9.5 |
| Total | 99.9 | 99.9 |

27. How much did the following people influence you in going to graduate school?

| | | A Great Deal | Somewhat | Not At All |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Father | M | 17.6 | 34.9 | 47.6 |
| | W | 18.2 | 29.3 | 52.5 |
| Mother | M | 18.2 | 34.2 | 47.6 |
| | W | 16.5 | 31.9 | 51.6 |
| Siblings | M | 6.6 | 17.5 | 75.9 |
| | W | 10.2 | 20.8 | 68.9 |
| A male faculty member | M | 30.4 | 28.7 | 41.1 |
| | W | 33.3 | 25.3 | 41.4 |
| A female faculty member | M | 9.4 | 12.4 | 78.4 |
| | W | 19.4 | 12.9 | 67.7 |
| Most friends of opposite sex | M | 6.4 | 28.4 | 65.2 |
| | W | 9.1 | 30.2 | 60.8 |
| Most friends of same sex | M | 12.1 | 38.2 | 49.7 |
| | W | 8.5 | 34.5 | 56.9 |
| Spouse, boy friend or girl friend | M | 22.0 | 28.0 | 50.0 |
| | W | 33.9 | 26.9 | 39.3 |
| Any other adults | M | 19.5 | 32.8 | 47.7 |
| | W | 30.2 | 26.1 | 43.8 |

28. How often do you feel each of the following ways after a discussion with a faculty member outside of class?

| | | Frequently | Sometimes | Rarely or Never |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Encouraged | M | 38.3 | 55.0 | 6.7 |
| | W | 42.8 | 51.7 | 5.5 |
| Discouraged | M | 10.5 | 57.2 | 32.3 |
| | W | 8.3 | 66.4 | 25.4 |
| That he is interested in your ideas | M | 33.5 | 55.7 | 10.8 |
| | W | 36.6 | 55.4 | 8.0 |
| That he is not interested in your ideas | M | 8.5 | 51.8 | 39.5 |
| | W | 5.6 | 47.8 | 46.6 |
| Not taken seriously | M | 6.8 | 36.3 | 56.9 |
| | W | 4.5 | 31.6 | 63.9 |
| Neutral | M | 13.7 | 63.7 | 22.6 |
| | W | 15.9 | 60.8 | 23.3 |
| Are taken seriously | M | 45.1 | 48.6 | 6.3 |
| | W | 46.0 | 49.0 | 4.9 |

29. Following are some hypothetical situations.

(A) A University of Chicago professor says women generally do not have the kind of mind suitable to a particular field.

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| This never happens | 7.7 | 4.0 |
| This could happen but I haven't heard of it | 67.3 | 57.6 |
| I have heard of this happening | 18.8 | 30.0 |
| I have heard a professor say this | 6.2 | 8.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

(B) A University of Chicago professor says the field in which a woman is interested has little or no career possibilities for women.

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| This never happens | 5.4 | 3.0 |
| This could happen but I haven't heard of it | 65.6 | 55.1 |
| I have heard of this happening | 22.6 | 33.1 |
| I have heard a professor say this | 6.3 | 8.8 |
| Total | 99.9 | 100.0 |

30. Is there at least one faculty member to whom you feel free to go?

| | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| About academic (shop talk) matters | 86.2 | 86.8 | 13.8 | 13.2 |
| About intellectual matters | 68.9 | 72.9 | 31.1 | 27.1 |
| About personal matters | 35.4 | 32.3 | 64.6 | 67.7 |
| About other matters (e.g., politics, weather) | 58.8 | 59.7 | 41.2 | 40.3 |

31. How many faculty members in your field are there who you feel respect your ideas and encourage you to complete your education?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| None | 15.2 | 11.9 |
| 1 | 14.1 | 20.1 |
| 2 | 22.8 | 26.2 |
| 3 or more | 47.9 | 41.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.1 |

32. Have faculty members made you feel that you were taking up too much of their time?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Never | 31.5 | 33.4 |
| Rarely | 37.7 | 38.8 |
| Occasionally | 26.5 | 24.1 |
| Frequently | 4.4 | 3.8 |
| Total | 100.1 | 100.1 |

33. Have you ever been invited to join in a discussion with a group of faculty members?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 42.8 | 34.8 |
| No | 57.2 | 65.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

34. When you want to see your adviser or sponsor, do you usually feel he is accessible?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 81.6 | 83.8 |
| No | 10.7 | 13.2 |
| Do not have one | 7.7 | 3.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

35. After seeing your adviser, how helpful do you usually feel he has been?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Very helpful | 27.2 | 26.7 |
| Somewhat helpful | 42.7 | 42.5 |
| Not too helpful | 20.4 | 25.6 |
| Not applicable or no answer | 9.7 | 5.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.1 |

36. Since coming to The University of Chicago, how many female faculty members have you had as teachers of courses?

| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8+ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Men | 40.4 | 24.0 | 15.3 | 10.6 | 5.7 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| Women | 27.4 | 24.4 | 18.0 | 17.0 | 5.6 | 3.8 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 1.5 |

37. Since coming to The University of Chicago, how many female faculty members in your department (or collegiate division) have you had contact with?

| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8+ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Men | 50.1 | 29.4 | 9.8 | 5.2 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.0 |
| Women | 35.7 | 33.7 | 14.5 | 8.3 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 2.1 |

38. Since you have been at The University of Chicago, has any faculty member in your department (or collegiate division) ever *told you or given you the impression that he thought . . .*

| | | No one | Yes, One Faculty Member | Yes, More than One Faculty Member |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| That you should apply for a scholarship or fellowship | M | 55.8 | 18.8 | 25.4 |
| | W | 56.4 | 22.2 | 21.4 |
| That the rate at which you are moving through the program is too slow | M | 84.6 | 9.2 | 6.2 |
| | W | 87.6 | 9.7 | 2.7 |
| That you are not working up to the University's standards | M | 87.0 | 9.7 | 3.3 |
| | W | 88.4 | 8.9 | 2.7 |
| That you should switch to another field | M | 93.5 | 5.4 | 1.1 |
| | W | 87.3 | 11.1 | 1.6 |
| That you are well suited for the field you are in | M | 47.9 | 19.4 | 32.6 |
| | W | 43.5 | 23.8 | 32.7 |
| That you are not a serious student | M | 89.8 | 7.5 | 2.7 |
| | W | 89.3 | 8.5 | 2.1 |
| You are one of the best students in one of his classes or his department | M | 57.5 | 26.1 | 16.4 |
| | W | 59.8 | 27.6 | 12.6 |
| You should drop out and get married or devote more time to your family | M | 99.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| | W | 97.1 | 1.9 | 0.9 |
| That you write well | M | 52.9 | 24.4 | 22.7 |
| | W | 49.4 | 23.5 | 27.1 |

39. How much time do you spend in informal discussion of intellectual matters with other students?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| More time than I want to | 7.7 | 3.9 |
| As much time as I want | 66.3 | 61.1 |
| Less time than I want to | 26.0 | 34.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 99.9 |

40. When you participate in informal discussions of academic work with other students, is the group *usually* made up of . . .

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| All same sex as you | 23.3 | 5.2 |
| Mostly same sex as you | 49.7 | 18.6 |
| About even | 24.4 | 46.4 |
| Mostly opposite sex | 2.6 | 29.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

41. Do you find that the *intellectual* quality of a discussion is *usually* affected by the presence of members of the oppsoite sex?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Yes, it deteriorates | 7.6 | 3.1 |
| No, it doesn't make any difference | 79.3 | 69.0 |
| Yes, it is improved | 13.1 | 27.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

42. When participating in an informal discussion of intellectual matters in a group of fellow students (both men and women), how often do you feel the following things?

| | | Frequently | Occasionally | Rarely or Never |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (A) That you are participating effectively in the discussion | M | 56.2 | 41.0 | 2.8 |
| | W | 55.7 | 39.0 | 5.3 |
| (B) That everyone else is stupid and you are wasting time | M | 3.3 | 33.4 | 63.3 |
| | W | 1.5 | 30.7 | 67.8 |
| (C) That your ideas are being ignored | M | 4.3 | 54.0 | 41.7 |
| | W | 4.3 | 44.7 | 50.9 |
| (D) That your contributions are appreciated | M | 36.4 | 60.7 | 2.9 |
| | W | 41.2 | 55.9 | 2.9 |
| (E) That you are left out of the conversation | M | 3.8 | 38.4 | 57.8 |
| | W | 4.8 | 38.3 | 56.9 |

43. Compared to most people in classes you've had where student participation is encouraged, would you say you've participated . . .

| | Much More than Most | | Somewhat More than Most | | About the Same as Most | | Somewhat Less than Most | | Much Less than Most | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W | M | W |
| High school | 42.6 | 44.4 | 26.8 | 25.3 | 14.3 | 13.6 | 9.2 | 9.8 | 7.1 | 7.0 |
| College | 15.7 | 14.9 | 30.0 | 22.4 | 28.6 | 28.2 | 15.9 | 22.6 | 9.8 | 11.9 |
| Graduate school | 11.4 | 13.4 | 27.9 | 25.9 | 37.2 | 31.6 | 17.3 | 22.8 | 6.2 | 6.3 |

44. When you have a point or question in class, do you usually . . .

| | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| Raise the point or question as soon as possible in class | 58.5 | 58.8 | 41.5 | 41.2 |
| Let someone else do it | 33.1 | 35.4 | 66.9 | 64.6 |
| Wait to talk to the professor after class | 53.6 | 48.0 | 46.4 | 52.0 |
| Wait to talk to other students after class | 48.8 | 55.9 | 51.2 | 44.1 |
| Usually don't say anything | 18.9 | 21.4 | 81.1 | 78.6 |

45. When you ask a question or raise a point in class, how frequently do you feel that the professor . . .

| | | Frequently | Sometimes | Rarely | Never |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Thinks the question is stupid | M | 1.3 | 24.7 | 56.4 | 17.5 |
| | W | 3.2 | 30.9 | 50.0 | 15.9 |
| Evades responding | M | 5.8 | 43.2 | 38.7 | 12.3 |
| | W | 4.2 | 43.1 | 41.2 | 11.5 |
| Gives a superficial response | M | 9.5 | 52.6 | 29.9 | 8.1 |
| | W | 6.7 | 58.2 | 29.4 | 5.7 |
| Doesn't like your participation | M | 0.9 | 15.7 | 50.4 | 33.0 |
| | W | 0.4 | 14.4 | 46.6 | 38.7 |

46. In your dealings with a faculty member has it ever happened . . .

| | | | | A. If YES: Did that bother you? | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes[a] | No | Yes | No |
| (1) That you felt the possibility of mutual sexual attraction | M | 0.2 | 88.9 | 0.3 | 10.6 |
| | W | 0.4 | 58.1 | 7.1 | 34.4 |
| (2) That the faculty member gave some indication of being sexually attracted to you | M | 0.2 | 92.3 | 0.9 | 6.6 |
| | W | 0.4 | 68.4 | 7.9 | 23.2 |
| (3) That you were sexually attracted to the faculty member | M | 0.2 | 83.3 | 1.1 | 15.4 |
| | W | 0.9 | 53.8 | 7.2 | 38.1 |

[a]Respondents who answered "Yes," but did not answer Q. 46A.

47. In your dealings with a faculty member have you ever felt that he was less receptive to students of your sex than to students of the sex opposite to yours?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 18.9 | 40.6 |
| No | 81.1 | 59.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

48. What would you *like* to be doing ten years from now?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Family | 0.0 | 5.2 |
| Family/career | 6.6 | 44.8 |
| Career only | 84.7 | 44.2 |
| Other | 8.7 | 5.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

49. What do you *expect* to be doing ten years from now?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Family | 0.2 | 6.0 |
| Family/career | 6.4 | 44.1 |
| Career only | 87.8 | 47.1 |
| Other | 5.5 | 2.8 |
| Total | 99.9 | 100.0 |

50. If you could have a choice, would you choose to have a career at all?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 81.3 | 92.1 |
| No | 18.7 | 7.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

51. How do the following people feel about your having a career?

| | | Very Favorable | Favorable | Not Too Favorable | Don't Know |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yourself | M..... | 60.3 | 24.1 | 11.1 | 4.4 |
| | W..... | 75.3 | 15.1 | 6.1 | 3.5 |
| Father | M..... | 77.0 | 19.0 | 0.8 | 3.1 |
| | W..... | 47.5 | 37.0 | 6.1 | 9.4 |
| Mother | M..... | 79.1 | 17.3 | 1.0 | 2.6 |
| | W..... | 49.3 | 33.4 | 10.9 | 6.4 |
| Siblings | M..... | 52.7 | 31.3 | 1.5 | 14.5 |
| | W..... | 33.8 | 27.4 | 5.2 | 33.6 |
| Other relatives | M..... | 61.1 | 25.2 | 1.1 | 12.6 |
| | W..... | 20.8 | 30.6 | 13.7 | 34.9 |
| Most friends of opposite sex | M..... | 43.4 | 37.6 | 1.7 | 17.3 |
| | W..... | 22.9 | 45.8 | 10.8 | 20.5 |
| Most friends of same sex | M..... | 42.9 | 39.9 | 2.5 | 14.8 |
| | W..... | 30.7 | 45.1 | 7.5 | 16.7 |
| Spouse, boy friend or girl friend | M..... | 62.0 | 29.4 | 2.1 | 6.5 |
| | W..... | 51.1 | 32.2 | 7.8 | 8.9 |
| Male faculty member | M..... | 46.3 | 26.6 | 1.1 | 26.0 |
| | W..... | 26.6 | 30.6 | 1.9 | 41.0 |
| Female faculty member | M..... | 35.3 | 22.3 | 0.7 | 41.6 |
| | W..... | 26.6 | 19.5 | 0.6 | 53.3 |
| Any significant older people | M..... | 53.8 | 25.0 | 0.3 | 21.0 |
| | W..... | 35.5 | 28.1 | 1.8 | 34.6 |

52. Ten years from now do you expect to be employed . . .

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Full time..... | 91.2 | 64.4 |
| Part-time..... | 5.4 | 29.2 |
| Not at all..... | 1.8 | 3.3 |
| Other..... | 1.6 | 3.2 |
| Total..... | 100.0 | 100.1 |

53. Which of the following do you expect to be your long-run employer?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Business | 9.9 | 2.8 |
| Professional office (own or partnership) | 12.3 | 7.0 |
| College or university | 48.3 | 42.8 |
| Junior college | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| Nonprofit research organization or institute not affiliated with a university | 3.0 | 8.3 |
| Welfare organization | 1.3 | 6.7 |
| Hospital or clinic (salaried) | 4.2 | 6.5 |
| Elementary school or secondary school (not junior college) | 3.1 | 11.4 |
| Government (federal, state, or local) | 3.2 | 4.7 |
| Church | 1.8 | 0.1 |
| Other | 12.3 | 8.7 |
| Total | 100.1 | 100.0 |

54. You may not fully agree or disagree with many of these statements. Indicate the one which comes *closest* to the way you feel for *every* one of the following statements.

| | | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|
| The husband of a career woman must be ready to make his career decisions jointly with her | M | 80.8 | 19.2 |
| | W | 76.7 | 23.3 |
| Women can make their greatest contribution in fields allied with their natural interests—caring for others, helping, and teaching | M | 29.3 | 70.7 |
| | W | 17.4 | 82.6 |
| Being a man has at least as many disadvantages as advantages | M | 57.4 | 42.6 |
| | W | 69.4 | 30.6 |
| It is a fact of life that women can work only when their family duties permit | M | 49.4 | 50.6 |
| | W | 45.4 | 54.6 |
| Husbands and wives should take turns caring for young children | M | 70.7 | 29.3 |
| | W | 78.2 | 21.8 |
| In hiring, or in admissions, a man ought to be given preference over an equally qualified woman because the man will be the breadwinner and the woman will not | M | 18.2 | 81.8 |
| | W | 6.7 | 93.3 |
| A woman's true happiness lies in being a wife and mother | M | 23.7 | 76.3 |
| | W | 19.6 | 80.4 |
| Being a woman has at least as many advantages as disadvantages | M | 72.2 | 27.8 |
| | W | 81.6 | 18.4 |
| It is in the best interest of a wife and children to place the husband's career needs first | M | 46.5 | 53.5 |
| | W | 48.8 | 51.2 |

(A) Name three women historical figures (not currently living) whom you greatly admire. (IF NOT WELL KNOWN, IDENTIFY.)

(B) Name three women currently living whom you admire. (IF NOT WELL KNOWN, IDENTIFY.)

(C) For each of the following categories please indicate whether you know a woman whom you feel has been successful in a career and as a person.

| | | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|---|
| Parent or relative | M..... | 57.6 | 42.4 |
| | W..... | 55.4 | 44.6 |
| Someone else you knew before coming to the University | M..... | 76.3 | 23.7 |
| | W..... | 80.5 | 19.5 |
| University faculty member | M..... | 57.3 | 42.7 |
| | W..... | 65.4 | 34.6 |
| Other person outside the University | M..... | 70.5 | 29.5 |
| | W..... | 76.6 | 23.4 |

55. Do you see yourself as . . .

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Top student..... | 43.9 | 37.0 |
| Average student..... | 53.5 | 61.0 |
| Below average..... | 2.6 | 2.0 |
| Total..... | 100.0 | 100.0 |

56. How would (or did) the following people feel about your leaving school before completing your education?

| | | Very Disappointed | Somewhat Disappointed | Not Disappointed | Don't Know |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yourself | M..... | 53.0 | 25.6 | 13.5 | 7.9 |
| | W..... | 62.3 | 23.1 | 10.1 | 4.6 |
| Father | M..... | 61.8 | 30.2 | 5.7 | 2.3 |
| | W..... | 55.6 | 29.6 | 9.8 | 5.0 |
| Mother | M..... | 66.6 | 26.7 | 5.1 | 1.6 |
| | W..... | 51.5 | 34.8 | 9.6 | 4.1 |
| Siblings | M..... | 27.6 | 43.7 | 13.4 | 15.4 |
| | W..... | 25.9 | 34.2 | 15.4 | 24.5 |
| Other relatives | M..... | 34.9 | 39.9 | 9.2 | 16.0 |
| | W..... | 20.2 | 34.9 | 14.7 | 30.1 |
| Most friends of opposite sex | M..... | 18.3 | 42.7 | 16.5 | 22.6 |
| | W..... | 16.0 | 40.0 | 18.9 | 25.1 |
| Most friends of same sex | M..... | 19.8 | 44.0 | 17.2 | 19.0 |
| | W..... | 18.2 | 42.7 | 16.9 | 22.2 |
| Spouse, boy friend or girl friend | M..... | 45.3 | 34.8 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| | W..... | 52.2 | 27.1 | 8.3 | 12.4 |
| Male faculty member | M..... | 27.6 | 39.8 | 3.9 | 28.7 |
| | W..... | 26.5 | 29.6 | 4.5 | 39.5 |
| Female faculty member | M..... | 20.6 | 29.8 | 4.7 | 44.9 |
| | W..... | 18.5 | 24.5 | 2.8 | 54.2 |
| Any significant older people | M..... | 33.9 | 36.2 | 3.0 | 26.9 |
| | W..... | 34.0 | 31.0 | 4.1 | 30.8 |

57. (A) Since you began college, did you ever interrupt your schooling?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 26.0 | 27.9 |
| No | 74.0 | 72.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

(B) If you never left school, did you ever seriously consider it?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 46.5 | 54.5 |
| No | 53.5 | 45.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

(C) Which of the following factors were important in your leaving or wanting to leave school?

| | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| The military | 24.3 | 0.2 | 75.7 | 99.8 |
| Financial difficulties | 27.4 | 26.6 | 72.6 | 73.4 |
| Not doing well in studies | 20.3 | 19.4 | 79.7 | 80.6 |
| Uncertainty about my long-range goals | 68.8 | 65.7 | 31.2 | 34.3 |
| Family responsibilities | 9.7 | 10.9 | 90.3 | 89.1 |
| Felt the education I was getting was not relevant | 46.4 | 47.8 | 53.6 | 52.2 |
| Wanted to go to work | 28.5 | 37.1 | 71.5 | 62.9 |
| Felt generally discouraged about school | 52.9 | 57.2 | 47.1 | 42.8 |
| Peace Corps, VISTA, etc. | 15.6 | 13.1 | 84.4 | 86.9 |
| Political activity | 12.1 | 5.8 | 87.9 | 94.2 |
| Emotional problems | 26.2 | 31.3 | 73.8 | 68.7 |
| Other | 15.4 | 17.8 | 84.6 | 82.2 |

If you ever dropped out of school or seriously considered it . . .

58. (A) When was that?

| | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | Women | Men | Women |
| During college | 58.0 | 63.3 | 42.0 | 36.7 |
| Between college and graduate school | 29.7 | 25.4 | 70.3 | 74.6 |
| During graduate school | 33.8 | 30.1 | 66.2 | 69.9 |

(B) Were you attending The University of Chicago at the time?

| | Men | Women |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 58.4 | 66.2 |
| No | 41.6 | 33.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

(C) Did you ever discuss your leaving school with a faculty member?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 37.8 | 29.6 |
| No | 62.2 | 70.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

If yes to C:

(1) Did the faculty member(s) with whom you discussed leaving try to help you work out your problems?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 75.9 | 67.2 |
| No | 11.3 | 11.2 |
| He couldn't have helped | 12.8 | 21.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

(2) Did the faculty member(s) with whom you discussed leaving school . . .

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Encourage you to remain in school | 62.9 | 76.6 |
| Encourage you to leave school | 22.0 | 12.1 |
| Seem uninterested in whether you stayed in or left school | 15.1 | 11.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |

## TABLE E.1

Highest Degree Expected, by Sex and Academic Unit (Unweighted), Percent

| Unit | Male | | | | | Female | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Highest Degree Expected | | | Total | | Highest Degree Expected | | | Total | |
| | B.A. | M.A. | Ph.D. or Professional | Percent | N | B.A. | M.A. | Ph.D. or Professional | Percent | N |
| Total University | 2% | 19% | 79% | 100% | 757[a] | 4% | 36% | 60% | 100% | 322[a] |
| Divinity | — | 6 | 94 | 100 | 34 | — | 6 | 94 | 100 | 17 |
| Law | — | — | 100 | 100 | 39 | — | — | 100 | 100 | 34 |
| Medicine | — | — | 100 | 100 | 26 | — | — | 100 | 100 | 13 |
| Business | — | 65 | 35 | 100 | 49 | — | 62 | 38 | 100 | 16 |
| Library | — | — | 100 | 100 | 8 | — | 68 | 32 | 100 | 28 |
| Social Service Administration | — | 34 | 66 | 100 | 35 | — | 75 | 25 | 100 | 24 |
| Graduate Biology | — | 5 | 95 | 100 | 40 | — | 8 | 92 | 100 | 37 |
| Graduate Physical Sciences | — | 4 | 96 | 100 | 47 | — | 21 | 79 | 100 | 34 |
| Graduate Humanities | — | 16 | 84 | 100 | 31 | — | 12 | 88 | 100 | 33 |
| Graduate Social Sciences | — | 16 | 84 | 100 | 45 | — | 26 | 74 | 100 | 39 |
| College Biology | 4 | 14 | 82 | 100 | 28 | 6 | 17 | 77 | 100 | 35 |
| College Physical Sciences | 10 | 17 | 73 | 100 | 41 | 4 | 18 | 78 | 100 | 27 |
| College Humanities | 7 | 18 | 74 | 99 | 27 | 6 | 55 | 39 | 100 | 31 |
| College Social Sciences | 9 | 21 | 70 | 100 | 56 | 6 | 29 | 66 | 101 | 35 |
| New Collegiate Division | 7 | 7 | 87 | 101 | 30 | 25 | 15 | 60 | 100 | 20 |

| | |
|---|---|
| N | 959 |
| NA on highest degree | 100 |
| Total | 1,059 |

[a]N's for total University are weighted.

## APPENDIX F

## DISSENTS AND COMMENTS

p. i. I agree with most of the specific suggestions in that I think that most of them should be carried out. However, I disagree with the general implication that these recommendations are adequate to bring about any significant change in the position of women on this campus. For further explanation see my General Dissent (p. 120). (Jo Freeman)

p. ii. As long as the University does not concern itself with the variety of life styles prevalent among women and the many needs they have which are different from those of men, it will inevitably discriminate against otherwise qualified women. The life styles of the population of intelligent, highly educated women is much more heterogeneous than those of the population of intelligent, highly educated men. The University is geared to serve the needs of the latter and those of the former group who most closely resemble these men or who can organize their lives, however uncomfortably, into the environment created for intelligent, highly educated men. Failure to realize that women as a group have a wider diversity of life styles than men as a group will result in an exclusion of those women whose life styles least resemble those of men. (Jo Freeman)

p. iii. It should be noted that many problems faced by women in this University do not relate at all to role expectations but to specific policies and/or attitudes by the University and the faculty which are detrimental to women. (Jo Freeman)

p. 4. Not only recruitment difficulties but many other problems are created for academic women by extensive use of the "grapevine" method. Jessie Bernard, among others, has pointed out that women are often excluded from the informal professional channels of communication through which much invaluable information is exchanged by colleagues. Because such informal communication networks are generally based upon friendship, and because men generally have other men as friends, and because women are such a small proportion of any profession that their communication networks are usually inadequate, predominant use of informal channels for recruitment and other professional activity will leave women at a serious disadvantage. Conversely such "grapevines" can be used to spread the word that a department is strongly interested in recruiting qualified women to its faculty. Since word about many excellent women is never put on the grapevine because of the unspoken and unquestioned assumption that an "elite" university would not be interested in a woman, it is recommended that such informal communications networks be used both to recruit and place academic women. (Jo Freeman)

p. 5. There is nothing neutral about procedures *per se*. Procedures applied equally to unequal situations (especially where so much judgment is subjective) will generally lead to unequal results. As discussed earlier, the sex variable is frequently salient in this regard. (Jo Freeman)

p. 6. Although the Committee did not have adequate data to examine precisely why there is such a consistent decrease in both the percentage and absolute number of women in the faculty ranks as one moves up the ladder, the existence of such a persistent situation in and of itself constitutes a *prima facie* case of at least covert discrimination. Not only do the number of women

decrease relative to the number of men, but the higher ranks of women decrease relative to the lower ranks. Almost one-half of all men on the faculty are full professors, while only one-eighth of the women are. This is true despite the fact that there was a relatively high percentage of female Ph.D.s during the thirties (about 16 percent) from which the current full professors would be drawn, and a much lower percentage (around 11 percent) during the fifties and sixties, from which lower ranking faculty women would be drawn. Further, national studies show that such older women tended to have a more consistent work life and at the age they are now would not be burdened with the socially imposed responsibility of family and child care. (Jo Freeman)

pp. 8, 19, 25. In these three places the Committee reports predominant expressions of satisfaction with their lot by women faculty, lecturers, and research associates who were interviewed by the Committee. Two factors should be kept in mind which mitigate against any strong reliance on these responses. The first is interviewer bias. It is well known that an untrained interviewer with predetermined ideas on the subject can elicit the expected response. Many interviews were conducted by faculty members of the Committee who were totally untrained in interviewing and had very definite opinions on the opportunities available to women. Feedback from some faculty women interviewed by such members indicates that the potentiality for such an induced bias was very great. The second mitigating factor is the failure in the interviews to relate attitudes about current situations to expectations or knowledge of viable alternatives. Most women compare themselves to other women, not to their male colleagues. By this measure, women at The University of Chicago are well off indeed and have every reason to be satisfied. It is those who compare themselves with men of equal ability and training who are likely to be discontent. Further, most women assume without question family and child care responsibilities not required of men and therefore would find a more vigorous academic life to be more demanding than their male colleagues. A part-time or non-ladder position can be quite optimum under these circumstances. Last but not least, consciousness of a potential alternative to one's current situation that is both possible and better, yet likely not be be gained because of social prejudice beyond one's control, always breeds discontent. The absence of such a viable alternative vision usually breeds complacency. Thus it is not suprising that more expressions of dissatisfaction were made by younger women and those in the social sciences, because it is among these groups that expectations have been raised and female consciouness developed. (Jo Freeman)

p. 19. The results of the Committee's inquiry into matters of promotion, equity in financial rewards, and extent to which the situation of women faculty is satisfactory or unsatisfactory may be influenced more by the methods of inquiry used than the presence or absence of discrimination.

*Equity in Salaries.*—Attention is drawn to the three sources of systematic bias in this study:

1. The twenty-six women faculty who did not have male "matches" and therefore were eliminated from the study are concentrated in the upper strata of the faculty hierarchy. The twenty-six include nine full professors (i.e., *only* two full professors were included in the equity study) and five associate professors. *Since the variation in salary is probably greatest at these levels, the absence of such a disproportionate number of women at these levels will tend to eliminate salary differentials which would otherwise have become apparent had these women been included in the study.*

Matching might have been achieved if male "matches" for such women were sought in similar fields within their divisions with evaluations from the two chairmen and the dean of their division.

2. If women are, in fact, discriminated against with regard to promotions (this was neither confirmed nor disproved by the very limited evidence at hand) this would not be evident from the fifty-five matched pairs. Inequities in salary which would arise from such differential promotion rates could not therefore have been identified by this study.

3. Bias resulted from methods used in selection of male "matches." Some department chairmen were asked to select, for each female faculty member in the department, a male in the same department, who, in their opinion most nearly matched her in terms of overall contribution to the department and the University. If pecuniary rewards received by faculty are, in fact, largely dependent on the value of that faculty member as perceived by the department head (as is indicated in the body of the text), then it might be expected that, given a female faculty member and a male "match" *selected in the manner described above*, the salaries they receive would differ little, if at all. The problem is that both the salaries awarded and the estimated value of each member of the pair to the department are the products of the opinion of the chairman about the two faculty members involved.

The possibility of bias in the formation of these opinions needs to be taken into account. Attention is drawn to the fact that, during the series of interviews with department chairmen which were conducted by this Committee, two chairmen expressed attitudes which may be interpreted as indicative of a negative bias towards women (see page 26 in the report). Thus, when chairmen were asked to give their *opinions* (no other data were required) as to which was the more valuable faculty member in a given "matched" pair or if no such differential existed, these opinions may have been influenced in some instances by traditional views concerning capabilities and appropriate roles for women.

The net effect of the three sources of bias outlined above is to render any findings of such a study on equity in salaries highly equivocal.

*Interviews with faculty women.*—The use of these interviews as evidence concerning the degree to which the situation of women faculty is satisfactory or unsatisfactory is fraught with a number of methodological problems (one of these is mentioned on page 10):

1. The interview situation frequently encountered was one in which the interviewee was a junior faculty member and the interviewer was a more senior woman; under these circumstances the interviewee may well have been discouraged from being outspoken about problems within this University. Thus the interviewees might have appeared to be more satisfied than they really are.

2. The interview transcripts are only the records of the perceptions which the interviewing faculty members had of what was said by the interviewees. These perceptions are subject to error and may, in some instances, be at variance with what was actually said by the interviewees. This problem is exacerbated where the interviewer (who is recording the interview) may be personally involved in the subject matter of the interview.

3. Interviews are ostensibly undertaken to obtain information from the interviewee. However, there is a growing body of information which indicates that the responses of the interviewee can be significantly modified, quite unintentionally, by the behavior of the interviewer, particularly through para-language and other forms of nonverbal communication. As might be expected this problem is much more serious where the interviewers have a personal involvement in the subject matter of the interviews. Furthermore, in some instances interviewers may bias the interview by injecting their own views into the discussion rather than listening to the interviewee. If interviewee responses were (a) modified as a result of the interview situation and (b) "corrected" during the course of the interview (as was reported by some interviewees and was also confirmed, surprisingly enough, by one of the interviewers), it is likely that the transcripts of the interviews present a rosier picture than the situation of women faculty at the University warrants.

(Rosemarie Gillespie)

p. 27. The occurrence of even a few instances of exploitation, as reported by some lecturers and research associates, even if it only involved a minority, would be cause for concern. Similarly the reported satisfaction of the many leaves no room for complacency concerning those who do have grievances and whose conditions of employment may be highly unsatisfactory. Local residents do not wait for the majority of their number to be killed at a dangerous intersection before installing traffic lights.

(Rosemarie Gillespie)

p. 42. It should be noted that women tend to be in those fields where aid is lowest. In fact there is an exact inverse relationship in the divisions between the percentage of students who are women and the percentage who receive aid. It is suggested that there is a relationship between those fields into which women are channeled by their undergraduate advisers and social expectations and those fields which have lower social and academic prestige as indicated by the funds available in such fields.

(Jo Freeman)

p. 43. The most striking thing about these figures is not that faculty support of women and men students differs by less than an overwhelming percentage. Rather it is the deplorably low amount of encouragement given to students of both sexes by the faculty. For a University which counts among its "primary tasks" the "encouragement of talented and dedicated students" these figures are appalling.

(Jo Freeman)

p. 48. The question of encouragement merits closer examination than the somewhat superficial treatment given in the body of the text, particularly in view of the stated aim "to recruit and encourage talented men and women students." Two basic questions need to be considered in this regard:

1. *The Social Environment.*—(i) Support perceived by men and women students from significant others (relatives and friends, but not faculty), and (ii) association between perceived support and aspirations.

2. *The University Environment.*—(i) Amount of general support perceived to be forthcoming from faculty, (ii) reported encouragement and discouragement perceived in given situations, and (iii) specific actions by faculty members (which may be interpreted as encouraging or discouraging) reported by students.

The following hypothesis has been suggested concerning the interaction between 1 and 2: Women receive less social support than men for their academic and career aspirations; they also receive less encouragement from faculty. The effects of differential social support and faculty support interact, placing women at a double disadvantage.

*1. The Social Environment*

On examination of responses concerning perceived social support for being in graduate school and having a career (Appendix E, #21 and #51) the reader will observe that:

(a) For all significant others, i.e., father, mother, friends, siblings, etc., fewer women than men perceived support for going to graduate school or for having a career. This relationship holds irrespective of whether the frequency with which respondents report that a given significant other is "very favorable" is taken as an indicator of support, or whether the indicator used is the frequency with which respondents report a given significant other as being "very favorable" or "somewhat favorable." The difference is greater in the former case; considerably fewer women than men perceive friends and relatives to be "very favorable" to their being in graduate school or having a career. (The response "somewhat favorable" is difficult to interpret, since this may mean to some respondents a mild but unenthusiastic support, while to others it may mean a begrudging kind of support which amounts to no support at all.)

(b) The differences in social support perceived by men and women students is greater when the question concerns having a career rather than going to graduate school. (Perhaps it is more socially acceptable to be "well educated" than to be a "career women.")

(c) The proportion of men and women who perceive little or no support for having a career, although small, is larger for women than for men.

Thus although most students, both men and women, perceive some measure of support for their aspirations, men and women differ in the amount of support perceived by them. It is plausible that human beings are sensitive to their social environment and that a preson receiving little, if any, support for his or her actions and goals would react by changing. An analysis by Ellen Fried of the National Opinion Research Center suggests that, for both men and women students, perceived social support is in fact related to commitment to graduate education and to having a career. The evidence at hand suggests that women perceive less social support and that support is linked to aspirations.

*2. The University Environment*

The differences between men and women concerning perceived faculty support for being in graduate school and for having a career has already been noted in the text (p. 48 and Appendix E, #21 and #51). The responses to these questions indicate to me that *only one-half* of the women perceive even a small measure of support from male faculty for their aspirations.

Examination of responses to the student questionnaire shows little or no difference

regarding perceived encouragement in given situations, accessibility of supervisor, and so on (see Appendix E, #28, #30, #31, #32, #34, #35, #38, #45). When amount of assistance and encouragement reported by both men and women students is considered, it will be observed that while 80 percent of students reported that their advisers were accessible (#34), only one-quarter of the students found their advisers "very helfpul" (#35) and one-quarter found their advisers to be of little or no assistance. Although most students report that they know at least one faculty member with whom they can discuss academic matters, it appears that they are also likely to be on the receiving end of a substantial amount of discouragement, as indicated in the following findings of the questionnaire:

(a) Two-thirds of the students reported that they felt discouraged at least sometimes after discussion with a faculty member outside class (#28).

(b) When asked about class participation and perceived response by professors to this participation (#45), over 60 percent reported that professors gave superficial responses at least some of the time; half of the respondents reported that professors sometimes evaded responding, and a quarter of the respondents felt that professors considered their questions to be stupid at least some of the time.

In the light of the high degree of selectivity for intelligence and achievement operating before a student is admitted, and the stated aim of the University "to recruit and encourage talented men and women students," these responses suggest that either the processes of selection of students are not working properly or the treatment of students by many of the faculty is at variance with the aims stated above, or both.

What implications does this have for women students? If, as the evidence at hand suggests, women students perceive somewhat less social support than men students, and if both men and women receive a substantial amount of discouragement (with the women perceiving more discouragement in some instances—see #29) then the negative aspects of the University environment may have a greater effect on women students than on men students. If such an interaction between the effects of the social environment and the negative aspects of the University environment does occur, it may contribute to attrition of women students at the graduate levels. Clearly it is not possible to come to any more than a tentative conclusion in this regard until more rigorous analysis of the data has been carried out. (Rosemarie Gillespie)

p. 48. The behavioral science courses I have taken at this University have taught me that "underlying attitudes" almost always result in "actual actions"—whether the receiver of these actions is aware of them or not. In particular the Rosenthal and Jacobson experiments illustrate the ways in which negative expectations are communicated by "actual actions" (see also the Statement by the Political Science Women's Caucus made in spring 1969). It is these actions, however subtle, which have the detrimental effects on the receiver. Thus this sentence in the report is a contradiction in terms. (Jo Freeman)

p. 50. The problem is not whether the departments can place their women graduates, the problem is where they place them. For reasons discussed in the dissent to p. 6, the departments need to make a special effort to overcome the differential *quality* of first placements between men and women students. Besides specifically trying to place qualified women in major universities,

they should also refuse to send *any* University of Chicago graduate to an employer, academic or otherwise, which discriminates against women. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act specifically exempts the faculty of colleges and universities, but they are not exempted under Executive Order 11375 (amending 11246, which applies to holders of government contracts, to include "sex"). Those potential employers who are not exempted should be informed by the placement office, placement officer, or placement committee that the University will not cooperate with any violator. Further, the University itself should request aid from the technical assistance division of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in bringing its own employment policies and structure into conformity with the letter and spirit of Title VII. (Jo Freeman)

p. 54. The fact that there are high similarities between the responses of men and women students to the student questionnaire does not necessarily show that most of the problems women face "are student problems and not specifically women's problems." It can show that the instrument developed to measure the differences between the problems and experiences of men and women students was inadequate for that purpose. The responses further show that the problems students face are numerous and that perhaps there is sufficient similarity between being a student on this campus and being a woman in this society to warrant some serious investigation into the position of students at this University. If student status here has the same effect on people as female status in the world at large, it is not surprising that the responses of both men and women students were similar. The responses of the women students indicating still greater dissatisfaction with their experience here would then mean that being female increases but does not significantly alter the problems students face on this campus. (Jo Freeman)

p. 55. While it is indeed gratifying to note the offering of some courses on women in the last two years, it should be realized that they do not begin to meet the need for such courses. Starting from a base of practically zero, their existence makes the change loom larger than it really is. It should be noted that over half of these were temporary, student-run, non-credit seminars whose life expectancy is rather short. Half of the remaining courses were taught by faculty members who have left or will soon leave this University. This is hardly a bright prognosis for the future development of such courses. What is needed is a concerted effort to develop and support research on women in all the relevant disciplines. It is suggested that this can best be done by the establishment of a Women's Studies Program, such as that proposed at Northwestern University and elsewhere. It would also be desirable to support this program with the creation of an Institute for the Study of Women which would have adequate resources to support research into the area. (Jo Freeman)

p. 61. I am not entirely in favor of the formation of the Committee on Women's Affairs, as I fear that it would lead the faculty and the University to feel they had no further responsibility to change the position of women on this campus. As an auxiliary to major efforts for improvement it could be useful in gathering data, serving as a knowledgeable intermediary, setting up some new programs, and encouraging those in a position to make significant changes to do so. But the danger is great that its formation would be the *only* major action to be taken and that the rest of the University would lapse back into unresponsive complacency. If this were the case, the formation of the Committee would serve primarily to deflect energy from the serious efforts that need to be made. However, if such a committee should be formed, I would like to concur with Susanne Rudolph and the others that it should have a strong executive with the interest, the resources, and the energy necessary to fulfill its functions. (Jo Freeman)

p. 61. Regarding the formation and structure of the proposed Committee on Women's Affairs I recommend that:

1. The members be *elected*, rather than appointed.

2. The committee consist of representatives from tenured faculty, untenured faculty, research associates, lecturers, students, and women employees.

3. Each member be elected from a given constituency (tenured faculty women, untenured faculty women, and so on).

4. This committee inquire into the situation of women employees.

(Rosemarie Gillespie)

*General Dissent*

One could make a long and detailed criticism of the methods used to gather data for this report: their inadequacy, their internal biases, their contamination of the responses, etc. But this would serve no real purpose at this time. The Committee did the best it could with the limited time, the overworked personnel, and the insufficient resources available. What comes out of this year-long effort is a report that is probably as good or better than any other similar inquiry at any other university. Yet it is very superficial. Even accounting for the spotty statistics available from the departments, it talks around the problem more than about it. Because the Committee could not clearly describe or analyze what it labels a "vague dicsontent," it chose instead to attribute this primarily to general social conditions about which it felt it was not concerned and the University not capable of altering. In those instances where discontent could be specified, the Committee preferred to note that this discontent was felt almost as much by men as by women in similar positions.

The major fault here lies not so much with the methods used as with the concepts available—and even the words to describe—the position of student and faculty women. That individual answers to specific questions fail to show, with some notable exceptions, gross differences in the experiences of men and women here does not necessarily mean that there are no differences. It can mean that the methods or concepts used were inadequate to the task at hand. The fact that there are so many references to so much unspecified disquietude indicates that some strong feelings are there which are not being clearly articulated.

The problem is that neither social science nor the very language we use has yet developed ways of talking about or understanding the situation the Committee was charged with investigating. It is only in the last few years that some means have been worked out to explore the nature of what has been variously termed oppression, subjugation, status deprivation, group self-deprecation, negative expectations, discrimination, etc. The Clark experiments are seminal in their innovative analysis of the effects of segregation on black children. Rosenthal and Jacobson have examined the effects on individuals of unconscious attitudes which could easily be applied to groups. Horner and Goldberg are about the only investigators who have sought to look

at similar phenomena in women. Suggestions that the Committee replicate some of these experiments here were rejected on the ground of inadequate resources and anticipated lack of cooperation by the faculty.

Until we develop more sophisticated tools for examining these phenomena, we will not be able to look with precision at their cause or their process. We can, however, see their results. These are to be found, not in individual responses, but in the overall group statistics. They clearly show that the higher one looks in the University structure, the worse the picture appears. The fact that only 70 percent as many undergraduate women as men want to go to graduate school (the primary goal for which this University trains its undergraduates); that twice as many women as men stop at the M.A. level; that women occupy a significantly larger number of non-ladder and nonfaculty positions than of tenured faculty positions; that women are in those fields of study with the lowest prestige and the fewest funds—these are all symptoms of this phenomenon which we cannot yet define well enough to discuss in other than the most circumstantial ways. But because we cannot be exact about it, we should not infer that it does not exist. Instead we should take this opportunity to understand the limitations of social science to examine reality. This examination should indicate new directions that need to be explored.

Although we cannot clearly conceptualize the situation of women, we can say some things about it. Realizing that my interpretation is a subjective one, I feel that at its core is the refusal of the University to take women, *as a group*, seriously. In this it does no worse than reflect the general social attitude. But for a University which prides itself on its preeminence, on being "elite," on having an incisive skeptical approach, this conformity is hardly laudatory.

One must also emphasize that the attitude of the University and the people in it is toward women as a group rather than toward individual women. Most men know individual women whom they treat with respect and most women know individual men by whom they are so treated. But these relationships are not extensive for the simple reason that one cannot know everyone. They are particularly not extensive between women students and men faculty because few students here are known well as individuals by more than a couple of faculty members. Nor are they extensive between faculty women and their colleagues because there are too few of the former to go around. So despite these few good personal relationships, or perhaps because they are so few, the general underlying attitude about women, their place, their roles, and their capabilities makes itself felt.

It makes itself felt in many obvious and many not-so-obvious ways. The lack of courses on women or the lack of material on women in the courses taught contributes to the feeling that women are not worth studying. Not only the paucity of faculty women but their decrease in numbers up the faculty ladder and their concentration in a few fields conveys to many the idea that high quality academic women are rare. The sex-stereotyped putdowns that woman students have heard that professors here have made reinforce the cultural value that women are often a joke. All these factors, and many more, add to the underlying attitude that women, as a group, are not to be taken seriously. In a place as serious, competitive, and concerned with preeminence as The University of Chicago it is not surprising that women end up in the back of the bus.

Nor is it surprising that so many women should express satisfaction with their situation. Like their male colleagues, they are part of our culture and share the common social attitudes

toward women as well as other groups. Given the reasons discussed in an earlier dissent (see dissent on p. 114) it is much more surprising that so many should be so willing to express the "vague discontent" that pervades the campus.

Expressions of discontent are usually results of changes in consciousness rather than of reality. If this study had been done two years ago, I suspect there would have been minuscule statements of dissatisfaction. If it is repeated two years from now, I predict that such feelings will have escalated exponentially. They will particularly escalate if the University treats this report, inadequate though it may be, with the same lack of seriousness that it treats women. If real, and I believe that it is, discontent will make itself felt regardless of whether a study can measure it or not.

The measurements of this discontent are not to be found in an individual's estimation of whether or not she was discriminated against or treated differently because of her sex. With rare exceptions, none will ever really know. Those women who have given little conscious thought to the possibility of discrimination will never be aware of the subtle ways in which it molds their lives. They will either be satisfied with their lot or will attribute such dissatisfactions they may feel to personal failings and extraneous causes. Those who are conscious are doomed to live in a world of everlasting doubt. For it is the very inability to know whether a particular act by a particular person was an act of discrimination which makes being a woman in this society and on this campus so damning and so damaging. To go through life never really knowing whether one is seen primarily as an individual or as a category; to engage in one's work with questions as to how much it will be judged strictly on its merit and how much as the product of a member of a group; to be unable to say that one is treated the same as others without hidden bias—these uncertainties in themselves wreak their own havoc regardless of what the real situation may be. It is because of these uncertainties that an avowedly sex-blind attitude is not sufficient. The University, its students, and its faculty are all part of society. For the University to say it ignores general social attitudes is only to reinforce them. They must be deliberately and effectively countered or they will continue to impose themselves on all of us. The result will not only be a loss of talent to the University but an even greater loss to the women themselves. (Jo Freeman)